Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 108, NO. 1 NEW YORK, MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1943 NUMBER 1466

Fascism in North Africa

As the facts leak out, we are beginning to learn that fascism has been stronger in North Africa than in other parts of the French-speaking world. There are at least five reasons why this is the case. First of all, there is the familiar colonial problem, with the French landowners and business men terrified lest any liberal measures encourage the natives to rise against them. These natives are miserably poor and they perform almost all the manual labor, there being hardly any French proletariat in North Africa. In the second place, there is the strength of native anti-Semitism, which is especially prevalent in Algiers. In the third place, there are the great vineyards and wheat ranches, whose owners have been conducting a profitable trade with Germany while the rest of the country went without food. In the fourth place, there is the systematic miseducation of the public by newspapers that published Vichy propaganda instead of news. Until our troops landed in North Africa, the Algerians believed that American industry had broken down and that Midway was a great Japanese victory. In the fifth place, most of the officials and army officers who supported the United Nations had either been arrested or transferred to France, while Africa was swarming with Vichy politicians who attached themselves to Darlan. There was an immense popular resentment against the Axis, but the Germans managed to turn most of it against the Italians, while preserving their own reputation for being not only efficient but fair-minded and *très corrects*.

This was the situation that General Eisenhower and his aides had to meet by rough-and-ready methods that are discussed in another editorial this week. It is the situation which we may later learn was responsible for the death of Darlan. Finally, it is the situation out of which a stable pro-democratic regime has to be created.

Food Under Ration

The war came a little nearer for Americans on December 27, when they learned that most kinds of canned foods, and many fresh meats, will be rationed beginning in February. The explanation is simple—our fighting forces, our allies and our civilians need among them more food than is available. In regard to canned fruits and vegetables, for example, the fighting forces and Lease-Lend are already taking one-third of the pack, and this will soon be one-half. The new rationing scheme will be on the point system, under which scarce foods have a higher point value, a plan that works very well indeed in Great Britain.

Even with rationing, our food problems will not be solved. As we pointed out last week ("Food for Those Who Need It"), in spite of war prosperity there are huge numbers of Americans who cannot afford to buy enough food of the right kinds to maintain maximum health and vigor. We are wasting a precious national asset when we fail to see to it that these citizens get the food they need. Donald Montgomery has just resigned as consumers' counsel of the Department of Agriculture, hoping by this act to draw attention to this difficult national problem for which little provision is being made even under the new program. Mr. Montgomery recommends that the food-stamp,

CONTENTS

The Week 3

Editorials
- Challenge to the Republicans 6
- Darlan and Giraud 7
- Radio Stars in the Draft 8

General Articles
- Help China Now . . . . Michael Straight 9
- Trouble in Dixie . . . . Thomas Sancton 11
- Peacemaking Has Begun: II . . George Soule 14
- The War within the War . . . Jennie Lee 16
- Will the New Deal Die in Congress? . . . . . Irving Dilliard 17
- Waking Up the OCD . . . Helen Fuller 19
- Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 21
- Children's War . . . . . Manny Farber 22
- Europe Underground 22
- The Bandwagon 23

Correspondence 23

Marginalia . . . . . Malcolm Cowley 25

Books in Review
- For Edmund Wilson . . . Rolfe Humphries 26
- The Beards: Part IV . . Richard Hofstadter 27
- That American Way . . . . John Storck 28
- Company History . . . . William Miller 29

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1942, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

milk and free-lunch programs be extended, that prices be kept down by government subsidy when necessary and that all foods be rationed at once except some cereals and perishable fruits and vegetables. This seems to us a sound program which deserves the fullest support.

The Dangers of Delay

For about a year, this country has had more trouble than necessary because shortages were announced weeks or months before rationing began. No adequate explanation has yet been offered why government officials did not keep still until rationing was instituted, and thus prevent the hoarder from snatching scarce articles out of the market. Both Secretary Wickard and Elmer Davis have said that in this case the job is so complicated that delay is necessary and secrecy in the meantime is impossible. We have to accept their judgment and to hope that the small minority of hoggish Americans will restrain themselves this time as they have never done in the past, even under threat of federal prosecution.

The Germans and the Nazis

In a full-page advertisement appearing in more than twenty daily papers throughout the country, a group of forty-nine distinguished Americans of German descent have condemned the Nazi barbarities against the Jews and the other innocent peoples under Hitler's sway and have called on the German people to return to the virtue of their forefathers and the honor of their greatest leaders and overthrow a regime which is "the infamy of German history." We not only welcome this action by American citizens who range all the way from Walter Damrosch to Babe Ruth. We also wonder whether the time has not come to make a similar appeal the official policy of the United Nations. We realize the extraordinary difficulties under which the German opponents of Hitler and his monstrous regime live and work. But we know that these opponents exist, and we have reason to believe that their number is increasing by leaps and bounds as the prospects of an Axis victory fade. We know too that in the other countries of Europe there are patriots who are daily risking their lives in the cause of human liberty and common decency. Is it not time that the Germans also give proof that they are willing to fight and die to put down a government which has brought suffering and death to so many millions? We think that it is, and we think that the time has come to tell them so. Let us now apply to them the same divisive tactics we have so wisely applied to Italy. And let us set a deadline on their answer. We cannot expect an immediate revolution in Germany, but we can demand some sign that a revolution is in preparation. We can tell the German people that this is their last chance to save themselves. What happens to them when the war is over must depend in large measure on the reply they make to that challenge.

Subsidies for Price Control

Many people do not understand why the government should give subsidies to business concerns to aid in price control, and it is now reported that the practice will be abandoned, at least in part. There are, in general, two kinds of subsidies. One is a flat grant to a whole trade or industry so that it can keep on selling without raising its prices, in view of its increased costs for merchandise or materials. This is criticized on the ground that in the end the taxpayers have to pay for the subsidy anyway. But it has two justifications: first, it distributes the burden more equitably; second and most important, it prevents the price rise from being carried on to higher wages and higher costs for other producers, thus stopping the spiral of inflation. The other kind of subsidy is granted only to the higher-cost concerns in an industry, thus maintaining full production without a general price increase for the product in question, which would yield undue profits to the lower-cost concerns and would cost the country many times as much as the subsidy.

Both types seem to us justifiable in the emergency, though of course neither is as good as more fundamental remedies. Some subsidies, for instance, have been necessitated by the failure of Congress to permit adequate control of crop prices. And in cases like that of copper, it would seem to us better for the government to insist on full production of all mines, paying each company enough to keep it in operation even if this involved different prices to different companies. It certainly would be a serious mistake in economic strategy to abolish subsidies without substituting something better to keep prices down. Those who shortly will have to pay more for food if Mr. Henderson's policy is abandoned will surely agree with us.

How to Prevent Colds

Three doctors in Minneapolis, Donald Cowan, Harold Diehl and A. V. Baker, have been conducting large-scale experiments among students at the University of Minnesota to see whether colds can be prevented by taking substantial doses of vitamins. Their conclusion is that they cannot. It is true that the students who took a multiple-vitamin preparation reported a decrease of more than 60 percent in the number of colds during the winter. The trouble is that when a similar group of students were given pills of no therapeutic effect whatever, they also showed an almost exactly parallel reduction. The doctors say that this effect is noticeable with almost every sort of experimental treatment to prevent colds among large numbers of people. Whatever you give them, even if it is only bread pills, the number of illnesses is much reduced. Is this because many colds are psychological

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in origin, and something about the experiment aids the psychology? Is it because people under observation take better care of themselves than is normal? Are they perhaps ashamed of catching cold and do they, part of the time, conceal the fact that they have done so? Here is an interesting problem of medicine.

When the War Jobs End

Isador Lubin, Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, came forward the other day with a valuable suggestion. Twenty or twenty-five million people are or soon will be working in war industries. With the end of hostilities, do what we will, a large part of them will be unemployed at least temporarily. Mr. Lubin suggests that a special "defense dismissal fund" ought to be set up to help these people. The employer should add a fixed percentage, say, five percent of payroll, to his existing unemployment-insurance taxation. The money should be paid into the federal social-security system and administered by the government. The employee could also contribute if he wished, and get correspondingly larger aid. A man who worked for two years at $30 a week, under a five-percent tax, would get $150, equivalent to five weeks' salary. If he made a similar contribution himself, he would get ten weeks'. Nobody wants to go back to apple-selling and Hoovervilles when this war is over; but that is what will happen unless we have sufficient brains and energy to adopt, as a very minimum, Mr. Lubin's proposal.

Free Speech in Wartime

The American Civil Liberties Union has stopped in its busy routine to take inventory of the status of civil liberties at the end of the first year of war, and reports that while on the whole democratic liberties have been faithfully maintained, constant vigilance is necessary to protect the rights of the individual and minority groups under the tensions of war. The Union points to the relative freedom of debate and criticism, the lack of witch-hunting, mob violence and the spirit of persecution, to the growing protection of Negroes' rights and the reasonably satisfactory adjustment of labor's claims.

That the situation is far better than in the First World War is clear. The federal government has undertaken a dozen prosecutions for utterances and publications under the Espionage Act since Pearl Harbor involving approximately 150 persons alleged to be connected with Axis agents whose conduct is deemed dangerous to the prosecution of the war. In 1917-18, 988 cases were commenced (and 968 more in 1918-19) not one of which showed the slightest evidence that the speeches or publications were actuated by enemy money or enemy plans.

On the unfavorable side, the Union cites the action of the Post Office Department in revoking second-class-mailing privileges, or barring from the mails, of some seventy publications alleged to impede the war effort, without hearing or specifications in many cases, a procedure which The New Republic has consistently protested as a denial of due process of law. Dangerous also to the democratic cause is the international censorship of opinion of a non-military nature. Recent protests both in Britain and the United States against the unreasonable restrictions on the transmission of information concerning race discrimination promise to result in a more liberal exercise of the censorship.

The Union views with alarm the unprecedented power assumed by the army, not subject to review by civilian authorities, to evacuate individual citizens held to be dangerous to military security from military areas on the West Coast, under which seventy citizens have been removed. Court action challenging the army's authority in connection with the Japanese American evacuation have had no practical effect except to help counteract the pressure on the government for even severer treatment of persons of Japanese nationality.

Civil Liberty in Michigan

Stanley Nowak, the son of Polish-Catholic immigrants, came to this country at the age of ten and received his education in Chicago. His initiation into the labor movement came at the age of sixteen when as a reporter for a Chicago newspaper he was assigned to cover the packing-house strike in 1919. His fight on behalf of labor ever since has been aggressive and courageous, and won him the support of Detroit's workers where he went in 1932 to work in the automobile shops and took part in the union drive of the United Automobile Workers, CIO. Elected to the Michigan State Senate in 1938, Nowak, who had come to be known as "the voice of labor" on the floor of the senate, was reëlected in 1940 and for a third time in 1942, running far ahead of the general Democratic ticket in his district, which includes the Ford stronghold. As vice-president of the American-Slav Congress, Nowak has been active in uniting the foreign-born in support of the war effort and was responsible for the enactment of a resolution in the Michigan legislature supporting the President's foreign policy.

In the face of this, it is difficult to understand the government's attack on Nowak's citizenship through an indictment charging him with falsely swearing at the time of his naturalization in 1937 that he did not belong to any organization "opposed to organized government" when he was allegedly a member of the Communist Party. The charge is ridiculous in view of his many activities in behalf of and as a part of organized government. The cry of communism has been raised against Nowak in every campaign but he has been elected each time with a larger vote. Nowak's friends claim that his arrest and indictment are the result of pressure from reactionary clerical elements in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the local government as well as from the anti-labor and anti-war forces. The American Civil Liberties Union, in going to Nowak's defense, points out that the United States Supreme Court has before it now a case involving the question whether membership in the Communist Party constitutes disbelief in organized government. This is the case of William Schneiderman, secretary of the Communist Party of California, recently argued on his behalf by Wendell Willkie. We hope the Attorney General will see fit to discontinue the prosecution against Senator Nowak, at least until the Supreme Court has rendered a decision.

Challenge to the Republicans

NOW THAT THE Republicans have a near-majority in Congress, with a majority of popular votes behind them—though not a majority of the voting population—they are in a position to show whether they ought to be entrusted with governmental responsibility. With the anti-New Dealers among the Democrats, they not only can block anything that the administration may want to do, but even can pass legislation which it does not want. With supporters of the President, on the other hand, they are capable of rolling up such an overwhelming majority as to constitute a symbol of national unity, leaving the Democratic dissenters far out on a limb.

Judging by past performance, many have assumed that the Republicans would choose to inflict the utmost possible damage on national unity, compromise the chances of victory in the war, be ready for an inconclusive peace and fatally botch the opportunity for a better world in the future. They, with the reactionary Southerners, have been intent first of all on discrediting the Roosevelt administration, and to do so have capitalized every possible disagreement and discontent.

They have declared their intention of abolishing compulsory payment of overtime over the forty-hour week, of amending the National Labor Relations Act in the interest of open-shop employers, of curtailing instead of expanding social security. They have done their best to block anti-inflation measures in order to mobilize the support of business profiteers, dissatisfied farmers and individual protesters against rationing. At the same time they have obstructed adequate and equitable taxation. Before Pearl Harbor they were isolationist, and now are in practice acting as if they wished to prevent the nation from seeking an all-out victory. Certainly the movement for a return to the international chaos which led to this war will find its principal expression in their ranks.

But it cannot be taken for granted that when faced with actual responsibility, the Republican lawmakers will recklessly put into effect the policies which they have advocated. It is one thing to complain while under the sheltering wing of a national policy which protects the complainer against his own folly, but allows him to solicit support from those who are annoyed by the necessary acts of government. It is quite another to undo everything against which one has complained, and frame a positive program in action by which one must stand or fall.

Again and again conservative forces in this country have come into power by capitalizing discontent with more liberal regimes, only to accept virtually everything those regimes have done and even to go further in the same direction. The process of social reform in the United States, as Charles A. Beard and other historians have pointed out, is not the property of any one party or even any faction, but a process which is far more continuous than one would infer by reading political speeches. Reforms first advocated by minorities are later accepted by ruling parties, and one party frequently carries the other's intentions to fruition.

Especially during a war, the Republicans may think twice before disrupting the national program, much as they like to assail it in speeches. Certainly they will not refrain from acting to remedy obvious flaws, and they ought not to do so. But if they outrage organized labor, or assume clear responsibility for an inflation which will impoverish every wage and salary earner as well as those who depend on interest-bearing securities; if they contribute to an imperiling or even a postponement of victory; if they have nothing better to offer to returning soldiers than business as usual with its usual unemployment; in any such eventuality they will be overwhelmed in the next election by hordes of angry voters.

One danger must, however, be carefully guarded against. In the past, the administration has had to suffer from the mistakes and omissions of a Congress which opposed it, because voters did not make the necessary distinction between the President and the legislative body, but held the party in power responsible. The Republicans might go on hampering and intimidating the administration, and then hope the voters would turn it out because of the ineffectuality which they had caused. In order to avoid this, the President will have to stop trying to conciliate the congressional enemies of his policies, and instead draw a sharp line between those who are against and those who are for.

He must dramatize the fact that if the Republicans and their Democratic allies wish to oppose him, they must take the responsibility before the public. It might be worth a defeat or two on specific measures in order to emphasize this division. Let us see how far the reactionaries will go if they have to account to the voters for their behavior. We are inclined to believe that they will not go far; rather, they will prefer to keep alive their grievances for use in the next election.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Darlan and Giraud

THE ASSASSINATION of Admiral Darlan has produced another of the lightning changes in a war that sometimes seems less a war than a nightmare creation of the combined imaginations of James Joyce, Franz Kafka and E. Phillips Oppenheim. It was quite proper for the American authorities—including President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull and General Eisenhower—to condemn the act, as it was quite proper years ago to condemn the shooting of Huey Long. In this case it was not only proper but necessary: for our leaders knew well the ruthless speed with which the Berlin propaganda machine would spread the fantastic charge that Darlan had been ordered killed by the Americans or the British. To any but the most gullible dupes of the Nazis, that charge has now been scotched.

Yet it would be idle and hypocritical to deny that to millions upon millions of ordinary people in the United Nations and in France itself, the news of Darlan's death came as a grim but unmistakable relief. To those who believe in retributive justice, Darlan's end must have borne the imprint of an unerring retribution for the tens of thousands of lives he had blasted and for the honor he had successively betrayed. But even to those who steer clear of the categories of fate and retribution, Darlan's death changed the whole political situation in North Africa and France, and changed it for the better. It has become a truism to say that "assassination solves no problems." Yet just as the detached historian of the 1930's will be likely to say that Huey Long's death changed the course of American history, so the detached historian of the 1940's will say that Darlan's death will have done something to change the course of world history.

At the present writing we have had no details of the assassin, except that he was a youth, and a Frenchman, and presumably had a mother living in Italy. The final judgment on his act will have to be left to the future. But it is regrettable that the American and French authorities had him executed so quickly and with so much secrecy. We can understand that in military trials speed and secrecy are essential. But in this case it must be questioned whether the North African authorities were wise in taking machinery that had been set up for dealing with military offenders, and using it in a case that had and is likely to have complex political ramifications. There are many things that the people of the United Nations would like to know about the assassination, and that a dead man will be unable to tell them.

What might have happened to Darlan's power if he had not been killed, cannot now be guessed. There were signs before his death that his power was waning, especially since the hold he had maintained over the American commanders lay less in their belief in his integrity than in their need to buy his help. With each concession that he made, he could be correspondingly surrounded by more controls. He had sold his honor on the instalment plan, and—save for the final transfer of Dakar—there was nothing left to deliver. But there were also some signs that the cunning little man was not to be outsmarted, and that he could play the game of power politics and diplomacy with mirrors as well as any American. We should have had to get up early to outsmart Darlan—once we had admitted him into partnership with us. He was not alone, but was the center of a powerful group of French industrial and military fascists. Their intent was to use the American need in order to entrench themselves beyond any hope of being dislodged from power, and to be in position to form a post-war fascist government in France. And they were well on the way to their goal. Darlan had used his power to get rid of Fighting French sympathizers, and replace them by his own clique. And the American government had so far compounded its original blunder as to appoint Robert Murphy virtually a minister to the Darlan regime.

Miraculously we have now been given a second chance. History has its ragged edges and, without a sense of economy, sometimes retraverses its path and offers us an opportunity to undo the mistakes that we have made. This second chance the death of Darlan gave to America and the United Nations.

What have we done with that second chance? The selection of General Giraud to take Darlan's place is likely to meet with fairly general approval. There can be no question that Giraud is infinitely preferable to the Darlan regime. We say this even with a knowledge of the deep conservatism of Giraud's outlook. But at a time when the old political creeds are in rapid dissolution, a man's formal outlook is less important than his integrity. De Gaulle was a monarchist once, and Darlan a member of the French Popular Front. Yet Darlan turned a treacherous fascist, and de Gaulle's movement has proved the most hopeful in France. Personal integrity is more important than past political history. And in the case of General Giraud, there will be few to question the personal integrity that he has shown ever since his escape from a Nazi prison.

But when a man is not only an individual but also the leader of a movement, one has the right to ask about more than his personal integrity: one has the right to ask about the ideological direction of his movement. With all respect to General Giraud and the men about him, that still remains to be seen. If he surrounds himself with men like Pucheu, Flandin, Noguès, Boisson, then he may become the highly patriotic figurehead of a movement which, despite the death of Darlan, retains its essentially fascist character. If, on the other hand, he understands the political aspects of the war, and makes room in his councils for the Fighting French and for the long imprisoned anti-fascist leaders,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he has a chance to make history for a democratic and reborn France.

He is being discussed in the American newspapers as the non-political general who will be able to bridge the gap between the French factions. We must be wary of this interpretation. Our military leaders and our State Department spokesmen have been taking the position that the difference between the Darlan and de Gaulle forces was merely the difference between two French factions, each equally partisan and equally extreme. But this is to vulgarize and distort the whole meaning of recent developments in the tragic history of France. The difference between Darlan and the Fighting French was in reality the difference between a fascist future for France and a democratic one. General Giraud will have to understand that he cannot be the real French leader until he has recognized that on the basic question of democratic ideology and humanist values, there can be no fence-straddling and no non-partisanship. There can be no compromise with the principle of fascism in an anti-fascist war.

It might have been better, as Pierre Cot suggested last week in Washington, if Giraud had been left as military commander of the French forces in North Africa, and if someone other than a Frenchman had been given the post of High Commissioner. Cot suggested that it be an American. If so, it should have been an American acting in the name of the United Nations. But, for the moment, that is water over the dam. What remains is to exact from Giraud and those around him the full measure of allegiance not only to France itself but to a genuinely democratic war.

Radio Stars in the Draft

A QUESTION that has caused many wrinkled brows in Washington recently is what to do about radio stars who are eligible for the draft. Of the twenty men with the highest ratings on the radio, a large proportion are of the proper age and marital status, and presumably physically fit to carry a gun. The offhand easy answer is that they should be inducted at once, that the draft should strike everyone, rich or poor, famous or unknown, alike.

But the radio experts argue that there is another side to this matter. They say that many people turn on the radio, not just to listen in general, but to hear one specific person. If he is not available, a large proportion of his audience, perhaps 30 percent or more, simply leave the set turned off. This, the radio experts argue, might prove a bad thing from the standpoint of the government itself. The popular programs are now being used to convey to the public all sorts of war appeals, and are of value for that purpose. It is even argued that these programs play a valuable part in maintaining public morale and that it might be a bad thing for people's spirits if they were suddenly deprived of half, or a third, or even a quarter of their most desired radio fare.

In theory, of course, the status of any radio star is determined solely by his local draft board. But draft boards are only human; if they were to get a request from an important government official for the deferment of a certain individual on grounds of public policy, they would certainly give it serious consideration. They could do so with a better conscience on the argument that perhaps a dozen men would be involved. It might easily seem to them that these men could be of more value to their country before the microphone than they could as a minute fraction of the armed forces.

The argument that radio stars should not be taken is also being applied in a few cases to producers of radio programs. Here, obviously, the theory of "unique and irreplaceable" is much more difficult to prove, if indeed it can be proved at all.

It should be said that the radio stars themselves are almost unanimous, and violent, in repudiating the idea that they should sit out the war in the broadcasting studios. Nearly all of them have expressed a strong desire to get into the fight. They get some nasty letters and, now and then, some abusive epithets face to face, accusing them of being slackers.

It is obvious that there is a difficult problem here. A good many New Republic readers, if we can judge by our editorial mail, consider practically all radio programs beneath contempt, and would be glad to see them all suspended; but evidently these readers do not speak for the majority of the population. Pending a final decision of this matter, there is one point that ought to be cleared up forthwith. If a young and healthy male radio star is being kept out of the army at the request of high government officials, that fact ought to be made public.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Literary Editor: ALFRED KAZIN

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: BYRON DEXTER, ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Help China Now!

ONCE MORE the Red Army has held the initiative for the United Nations at a crucial moment in its early life. To transform this rhythm of the initiative into a rhythm of victory the world over is the great task of the United Nations in 1943.

The strategy of a democratic alliance, as ours is, should be related closely to the spirit of the peoples of the world. Yet so far, it is the Japanese rather than we, whose actions have been determined by a sharp appreciation of the political factors involved in popular sentiment in Asia. If, in 1943, we relate our strategy closely to the political situation in Asia, we must conclude that the recapture of Burma is a most urgent necessity. The Chinese, reticent and proud as they are, have broken their silence to press upon us the extreme gravity of a growing economic and social crisis in China, that only the reopening of China's roads to the world can resolve. The offensive of General Wavell in Burma is based on a recognition of this crisis and it has been warmly welcomed by the Chinese. Yet its objectives are apparently limited to the recapture of Akyab, and this, for China, cannot be of real value.

The slow strangulation of China's access to the outside world is the basic cause of the difficulties which she faces now. It has led, not simply to the choking off of supplies vital to China's resistance but to a shifting of the political balance within China through the weakening of two of China's most militant sources of leadership, the Chinese Communists and the Western-trained intellectuals.

In the early days of China's war with Japan the United Front between the Kuomintang and the Kungchantang—the communists—flourished, and was part of a world movement of democratic resistance. In part it was the isolation of China, after 1938, which led to the breakdown of this spirit.

The armies of the central government had been trained by General Falkenhausen, and other German advisers, in positional warfare. The Kungchantang, for lack of heavy weapons, was forced to specialize in guerrilla warfare. In this period the Central Government realized that, soldier for soldier, its troops were better than the Japanese and that, given weapons, it could drive the Japanese from China while maintaining its power. When the Hankow-Canton Railway was severed, the Central Government still hoped that it could obtain sufficient weapons by way of the Indo-China Railway and the Burma Road to maintain its strategy of positional warfare and its dominance over China. So, in 1939 and 1940, the Central Government still attempted to extend its fixed battle lines. But when the Vichy government handed Indo-China over to Japan, and when Britain, hard-pressed in Europe, closed the Burma Road, the possibilities of successful positional warfare seemed to be destroyed. From then on, until supplies could be obtained, China's main hope lay in guerrilla warfare, the strategy of the Kungchantang. Already the communists had made important advances in China, because of the United Front; the Central Government felt that a military stalemate might lead to the gradual extension of communist administration over occupied and free China, involving the elimination of the strongest sources of Central Government support, the local magistrates, the gentry and the government workers. So the Central Government moved into open hostility towards the Kungchantang, which led to a battle in the Northwest in July, 1940, and to repression in Central China after January, 1941.

There was a second way in which the isolation of China accelerated this political transformation. When China had been open to the outside world, American journalists had won such support for the Kungchantang in the democracies that its position within China was greatly strengthened. But in 1940 and 1941, American influence in China shrank, and with it, the Central Government's fear of alienating support for China decreased. Had Britain and America not begun to show the first signs of active support for China, her militant spirit might have perished in a civil war which could only have ended in the annihilation of the Kunchantang, the establishment of a military dictatorship and probably in the partitioning of China.

More important than the communists in the development of democracy in China is the group of Westernized Chinese who are natural leaders in the war. They are the government workers, the teachers, the editors, the scientists, the field organizers of the hospitals and the coöperative movement, and the merchants and bankers of the treaty ports who are progressive because they believe in the industrial development of China, and so in her political unity.

In 1937 and 1938, this group reached the peak of its influence, despite the indifference of the democracies towards China. Again, the loss of China's access to the West robbed this group of the economic and cultural ties by which it lived. When the flow of literature from the West was cut short, the intellectuals—economists, legislators, writers—were isolated from the development of Western thought.

But it is the inflation which has really weakened the position of the Westernized Chinese. Most of the group are salaried workers, and while their salaries have been trebled by bonuses over the past three years,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices have risen by seventy times. Oranges which cost 50 cents a basket now are $4 apiece. A sack of flour which once cost $3 now costs $200. Desperate poverty has forced many Chinese intellectuals into manual labor or subsistence agriculture. In this way inflation is liquidating a group which has been a main driving force behind the war.

In a broader sense, inflation is undermining the health and efficiency of the entire Chinese people. The soldiers, who are better off than most groups, have suffered a decline in their standards of living, and because of the capital cost of recruiting and equipping each soldier there is a natural tendency on the part of each general to save his troops. The peasants have suffered less than most, yet they must buy matches, kerosene, clothing. They work barefoot, or in straw shoes; their consumption of cotton clothing—their only clothing—has fallen from four to two pounds a year.

Today inflation is increasing at a fantastic rate in China. It is threatening China's economy with a partial breakdown. There is always a struggle in China between a modern and a medieval economy. As communications are disrupted and markets are disorganized, the pressure increases upon China to fall back into a semi-feudal state. There more than in any other country, the techniques of government are derived from the technical instruments for government administration which are available. To prevent the fragmentation of its national organization the Central Government must extend its controls as the pressures upon it increase. Yet the inflation itself weakens the techniques of democratic administration. More and more the Central Government is forced to rely for local administration upon two groups traditionally hostile to popular government, the army and the large and growing secret service of Tai Li. In the right wing of the Kuomintang, in men such as Ku-Cheng-kan, Chu Chia-hua, Chen Li-fu and Chen Kuo-fu, this reaction away from democracy finds political expression in a conviction which, arising from a sense of discouragement in the democracies, asserts that by the use of Japanese techniques China can most easily defeat Japan.

Some Chinese have written in the American press that the situation in China is desperate. It is not desperate, but it is grave. There is no peace sentiment in China; there is always a possibility that if, through a deterioration in our relations, the influence of leaders such as the Generalissimo, Madame Chiang and T. V. Soong should be weakened, the groups which form the reaction against modernism and democracy in China might coalesce.

What must we do? We know that a part of the inflation in China is due simply to a lack of foreign supplies. The Indo-China Railway, for example, carried 40,000 tons of imports into China every month. The Burma Road carried 10,000 tons. Now China receives 500 to 1,000 tons each month, most of which is for the American forces. For lack of imports, hospitals are in trouble everywhere in China, and some arsenals are running short shifts.

More important is the psychological basis for the inflation in the demoralization of the Chinese people. They find little hope of relief for China in the island-hopping strategy of America in the Southwest Pacific. They know that the new routes that are being built into China, and even the rapid development of air transport, cannot carry to Chungking the supplies which even now are piled up in India. They know that their one hope lies in the reopening of the Burma Road, but they find little evidence of this objective in present Allied strategy.

In speeches such as that of Winston Churchill, in which he looked forward hopefully to an armistice in Europe before the conclusion of the war in the Pacific, they even sense a conviction that this is the desired development of the war, for the reason that an early reconquest of Southeast Asia by Chinese and American troops might lead to self-government in this region, while a later conquest, by a British navy freed from other duties would lead naturally to a restoration of British rule. The demoralization of the Chinese people which this bleak outlook has created results inevitably in hoarding, and hoarding of vital foods and materials is now the most urgent problem that China faces on the home front.

Yet the Chinese, in pressing for a Burma offensive, have no intention of putting it on a relief basis, as a charitable enterprise to aid China's morale. They maintain, rightly, that Japan can be decisively beaten from China in far less time than it will take by our present tactics. They stress not simply the military opportunities in the form of splendid airfields that are available in China, if they can be supplied, but also the political opportunities; for just as the closing of China's roads to the world led to internal disunity, so the reopening of these roads can restore the unity of China which could drive the Japanese back into the sea.

The Chinese have no intention of pressing this offensive as an alternative to the opening of a second front in Europe. They ask simply for an opportunity fully to state their case. That case is this: that the two offensives are alternatives only to minds which think in fixed terms about the techniques of warfare and the kind of war which we are fighting.

At present the United Nations are invading Burma with Indian troops, under a British general. They have pressed forward through an unfortified area populated by Indian Mohammedans who reach from Chittagong to Akyab, and were a majority in Rangoon. This population has been oppressed by the Japanese and so has welcomed our return. But beyond Akyab, our present strategy would lead to disaster.

The Burmese despise the British, and the restoration of British rule, brought about by General Wavell

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to them would be a repulsive prospect. Also they are antagonistic to the Indians. More than one-half of the capital invested in Burma was Indian and the resentment of the Burmese was shown when they looted the Indian refugees who fled after the fall of Rangoon.

In contrast, the Japanese have administered Burma in a way quite different from the Nazi occupation of Europe. The Japanese knew that their hold upon Burma depended upon their ability to raise a National Army of Burmese who would defend their country against an allied counter-attack. Also, they knew that their administration of 15,000,000 Burmese would be of crucial importance in their plan to capture their real objective, the 300,000,000 Indians who lie just beyond Burma. The Japanese freed from jail the former Prime Minister of Burma, U Saw, and made him head of the Provisional Government of Burma, which they announced was to become an independent state. In this government they placed only one prominent Japanese adviser. They further appealed to the peasants by breaking up the great, foreign-owned paddy estates. The Japanese do not face the necessity of ruthlessly exploiting Burma as the Germans have exploited Europe, for unlike Europe, which is a net importer of foods and materials, Burma was a heavy exporter of rubber and rice. So the Japanese have every opportunity of bringing the people of Burma actively to their side, against the United Nations. Given this political condition, it is possible that Burma will never be retaken by British generals and Indian troops.

We have one chance in Burma—to place our offensive under a Chinese general, with predominantly American aid, and to prepare our offensive with the most intensive political warfare, based on the most explicit promises of self-government at once. If we are to attack at all, we have no time to lose. In the middle of May the monsoon begins which floods Burma with 460 inches of rainfall. Already we may be too late, but the case must be heard. The most urgent administrative task of the President and the Prime Minister is to broaden the base of the United Nations so that the leaders of China—and those of Russia—may take their place as equals in its councils.

Washington MICHAEL STRAIGHT

Trouble in Dixie

I. *The Returning Tragic Era*

STORIES began to circulate through Memphis late last spring that a Negro uprising was threatened at Jackson, Tennessee, a smaller city eighty-five miles northeast. People called Memphis newspaper offices to ask what there was to the story. Reporters assured them that an investigation had proved the rumors false. But in Memphis the stories persisted. People passed along the tale that in Jackson police had mounted eight machine guns atop the courthouse, and that white barbers and other tradesmen were working with loaded rifles by their chairs. There were rumors of shootings that had already taken place. After a while the talk died down and the incident seemed to be closed.

A Memphis newspaper reporter told me that an investigation made some time later indicated that these stories of an uprising started in Jackson in a group of white men who had passed the building of a well known Negro fraternal organization at two o'clock in the morning and had heard people talking inside. An initiation had taken place and the Negroes were still assembled. The passersby got the idea they were plotting against the whites. This phrase, plotting against the whites, used to be employed only humorously in the South. But now too many white people have become excited and irresponsible in their talk of race trouble, and it is a joke no longer. In Jackson these white men passed the word around that the Negroes were conspiring.

The Memphis reporter told me that when the scare began to grow serious, the Jackson Chamber of Commerce, with good judgment that could be copied in many other cities in the South, printed a rumor blank which was distributed by its members throughout the city. When a person who came into a store began to talk about the uprising, the member suggested that the FBI ought to be told about it, and handed the person a blank. There was a space to write in the rumor, and also a space for the names and addresses for the people who had passed along the information. Sometimes the rumor-monger got as far as writing down the story, but the space for names stopped him. That's how it goes with these things in the South today. When you refuse to put heads together about "the niggers" and mutter like old women, but challenge rumor-mongers for the proof of their information, their answers are the same. I didn't say I saw it myself; it's a fellow that works in my office; it's a friend of my wife's; it's a guy who works for my brother-in-law. Finally the rumors began to die down in Jackson and in Memphis. But the talk continued, in this town and in every town in the South, that the Negroes were getting restless, sullen, uppity, out of line, and that something was going to have to be done about it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In August, some months after the Jackson rumors, the city of Memphis began preparations for its first blackout test. Rumors started again. This time Memphis was to be the scene of the uprising and the blackout was to be the signal. This time the stories gained intensity, with unnamed white people telling others of warnings passed along by unnamed Negro servants. For the first time similar rumors apparently were being circulated by the Negroes: some of the Negroes thought the white people were planning to use the blackout for a massacre. One of Beale Street's leading Negro business men told me this:

"Somebody was working both sides of the street. I believe it was the Axis. Wild rumors began to circulate through both the white and Negro communities days before the blackout. Some of the Negroes were passing stories that the white men were planning to raid specific Negro sections. One story said Orange Mound; another Klondike. The white people were telling one another that the Negroes were going to stage a rebellion in the blackout. When the blackout came, some of the whites even passed the word that the revolt was under way. Some passersby ran past some people standing on their lawn in a white neighborhood and shouted that they had better run inside and lock the doors because a crowd of about 200 Negroes were working down from Florida Avenue shooting and burning."

Neither city authorities nor the newspapers made any open recognition of the rumors. The police and the FBI checked on them, but found no evidence of planned violence by either whites or Negroes. In both communities the riot talk was defensive and fearful. Memphis officials decided that to give the matter official recognition would agitate it (an attitude now common but not confined to the South). A large number of well armed police and plainclothesmen were posted around the streets of Memphis on blackout night. The blackout test came off without incident. About this same time the city of Norfolk, Virginia, experienced similar wild rumors on the occasion of its first blackout.

After the August blackout the rumors of race riots quieted down in Memphis. But the "tri-state" area, the corners of Tennessee, Arkansas and Mississippi, had been stirred up. Stories washed back and forth across the area like the wake from a ship. Suddenly, in the beginning of October, they flared up again in Memphis. This time, the stories said, the Negroes *were* going to have an uprising. The real thing. People began to call the Memphis newspapers in even larger numbers, to talk more excitedly than ever. The Memphis wire services began to receive messages asking if there was "anything to wild riot rumors."

The rumors continued to spread in Memphis, and suddenly many of the stories began to crystallize around a specific date—Monday night, October 5. White people called one another to warn them that the Negroes had set this time. Apparently the excitement among the white people did not have its counterpart on this occasion in the Negro population. Most did not know it was going on. The few who did were Negro servants, or had been informed by Negro servants, who had been asked by white employers or by the police what they knew about the uprising.

Many of the stories had begun to fix Monday night as the time of the uprising. But this was one whole day too soon for the climax. Monday night passed without event. But when Tuesday arrived the rumor was ready for its real fruition. Early in the day white men began to tell one another that the Negroes would riot that night. This time sure. They said that police had learned that the Negroes had collected arsenals of guns and knives, and that the riot was definitely set for that night—Tuesday.

In the afternoon the rumor reached high tide. An editor told me that probably not ten white citizens in Memphis could be found who had not heard it. A story began to spread that many of the big businesses in Memphis were sending their women employees home early, some even in taxi-cabs, with instructions to get off the streets before the riot started. To give the story an authoritative tone, one rumor began to spread that women employees of the War Department at the large quartermaster depot were being sent home. A month later it was impossible to find out if any groups in Memphis had actually done this, but I was told that a few of them probably had.

A number of women began to telephone their friends to tell them to stay home and lock the door that night because the Negroes were going to riot. One woman claimed to have telephoned fifty friends. People passed the word next that the state guard had been called out and issued arms and was forming at the fair grounds. A reporter called the commander. It was true, the guard was out. But the commander pointed out that it was Tuesday night and the guard trained on the fair grounds every Tuesday night. The rumors were becoming an explosive mixture of truth and lies.

By late afternoon the situation had become too ominous to be ignored any longer by the press and city officials. There had not yet been any clashes and the Negroes went about their ways, most of them ignorant of what was happening. But if the rumor had been allowed to run its wild course, a brawl would have broken out inevitably, probably on a Jim Crow street car. White men would have run to their homes for rifles and shotguns and many a Negro, whether or not he fought back, would have been shot down. Hitler would have won a tremendous victory in Memphis.

When a violent event which has been threatening does not come off, no one can really know whether it almost took place or whether it came within a million miles. But Memphis had reached a pitch of excitement which probably compared with the tension in Atlanta on the monstrous day in 1906 when white men

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave way to the blood-lust and shot and bludgeoned some forty Negroes largely because a criminally irresponsible editor had got out a series of extras carrying faked accounts of assaults by Negroes on white women.

In Atlanta, a firebrand editor and a newspaper furnished a spark for the populace and suddenly, like a flash, a ghastly race riot was under way on the city streets. In Memphis the newspapers helped furnish the level-headed thinking, along with city officials and the FBI, which counteracted the riot rumors. All of these agencies waited far too long to do it. In Memphis, late Tuesday afternoon, an announcer read a statement denying the riot rumor over The Commercial Appeal's radio station, WMC. Later that night he repeated it:

"These rumors have been thoroughly investigated, according to Percy Wyly, special agent in charge of the local FBI office, and there is no racial trouble in Memphis. Let me repeat. These rumors are groundless and there is no racial trouble in Memphis. The next time you hear a person say there is, ask him where he found it out. Pin down the rumor-mongers! Make them tell you the facts."

That night a long official silence was broken and statements to this effect were issued by Special Agent Wyly, Mayor Chandler and Joe Boyle, commissioner of public safety. A group of six leading Negroes also issued a statement with such a message. It said:

"The Negro has no grievance against the white people of Memphis and will regard anyone, white or Negro, who spreads rumors to the effect that they have such grievance and are planning trouble, as a traitor."

The Commercial Appeal and The Press-Scimitar carried front-page stories and texts of all the statements. Clark Porteus, a reporter for The Press-Scimitar whose fairness was respected by city officials and Negro leaders, was in part responsible for bringing about an open approach to the danger. There was no violence on the night of October 7 and the rumors subsided in Memphis. Their backwash continued to spread across the tri-state area and for a time the wire news services continued to receive messages from points like Little Rock to the effect that: "Fantastic rumors continue to circulate; police headquarters hears eight Negroes killed in Memphis." After a few weeks the Memphis riot, or riots, were formally over. No one had been killed. Immeasurable damage had been done to relations between the whites and Negroes, millions of whose numbers must live together in the South forever; and nothing had been done and apparently nothing would be done by any governmental body, the city, the state or the national administration, to face up to the fact that race relations in the South are drifting aimlessly, drifting in the winds of hysteria and wild rumor rather than in the channels of intelligent policy, and drifting in the direction of riots and bloodshed.

I would advise Virginius Dabney of Richmond, Virginia, and his colleagues not to feel so sure that these riots are threatened chiefly because of the hot-headed speeches and writings of "a small group of Negro agitators and another small group of white rabble-rousers." The hot-heads exist and they aren't helping matters any. And this also goes for a large section of the Negro press, which, I have become convinced (for reasons which shall be discussed in a later article), is primarily interested in circulation. But why aren't these Southern white editors, in language just as strong as they adopt toward the Negroes, hammering away at their own circulation the fact that their fiercely unyielding attitude toward the Negro is stupid, blindly selfish and intolerable in these times when men are dying all over the world for symbols of freedom and democracy. Southern housewives who sit around passing on riot rumors and talking against the Negroes, because their own servants are showing some economic independence, are feeding the fires just as dangerously —and in infinitely greater numbers—as are Negro leaders who demand the impossible overnight abolition of Jim Crow. If riots come, these white people will share a grave measure of the responsibility. These people inhabit the jurisdictions of these Southern editors and of their powerful newspapers. Educating these people for concessions on the race issue which the war demands—even though they don't want to be educated —is an editorial responsibility which rests on these Southern editors. They should discharge it. They should stop blaming the race tension on a "small group" of agitators, when its real causes lie in a conflict between the feudal structure of Southern society, of which they and their newspapers are an integral part, and the concept of a people's war.

I do not think more than a negligible fringe of Negro people have been infected by Axis propaganda, unless agitating for democracy in a democracy can be called exclusively the result of Axis propaganda. What is happening among the Negroes in the South and throughout the country is a direct result of the war. The Negro has passed from the defensive to the offensive as a social group. The whites don't like it, and their counter-offensive is under way. It is happening throughout the country, in fact throughout the world, and the phenomena of race relations one observes in a small Southern city is made of the same stuff as the Tory crisis in India. In the South a strong sense of spiritual and economic independence has been sweeping through the Negroes for the first time since Reconstruction. This time it is the real thing. It is a feeling which has sprung out of the Negro race itself; this time they are prepared for it and this time the white man can't stamp it down as he did after Reconstruction, or not so easily. This time the white man must make some intelligent and courageous adjustment in the Negro's behalf; or he must be prepared, at a greater social cost, to sink to levels of brute force in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confronting the Negro. It is brute force, rather than adjustment, toward which the South right now is drifting. And this element of blind drift is the most dangerous part of the crisis. For the real crisis is yet to come—when the boys come marching home.

Race friction in the South today is sensationally bad only in spots. The great masses of whites and Negroes are still living peacefully side by side under the old system of white supremacy. The real crisis will appear when some hundred thousand Negro troops return to the state of Mississippi, and similar proportions to other states, after having fought abroad in the armies of a democracy. But twice as many white boys will come back too. "Then let the niggers start this equality business," a friend said. If the element of drift, rather than of preparation, continues to dominate this race question, the South once more is facing the tragic era.

THOMAS SANCTON

Peacemaking Has Begun

II. *A World Economic State*

PERHAPS THE GREATEST MISTAKE of the peace settlement after the last war was that while it introduced grandiose political changes, including the redrawing of countless boundaries and the establishment of the rudiments of world government, it utterly failed to provide any economic blood and sinews with which to bring this skeleton to life. Indeed, as readers of Keynes's "Economic Consequences of the Peace" learned soon afterwards, it made the situation infinitely worse by creating an economically segmented Europe and introducing impossible international burdens of payments in the form of reparations and war debts. We shall be wise if this time we begin at the other end. If once we create worldwide economic institutions which will knit peoples together instead of setting them apart, and if these institutions are so well conceived that they give rise to an economic order which abolishes involuntary unemployment and lays the basis for individual security, we shall provide the nations a stake in international comity such that the growth of political bonds will be easier to achieve.

The apostles of nineteenth-century laissez-faire, it is well to remember, believed the institutions which they favored would automatically lead to such an order. Abolishing tariffs and other trade barriers would favor specialized production where it could most efficiently be carried on, and the expansion of trade to the benefit of all. In regions where production was so active and effective as to produce a surplus, capital would be saved, and would be invested in underdeveloped regions, thus enhancing their productivity and welfare.

There was nothing the matter with the ends so conceived. What was wrong was the assumption that they would automatically follow the liberation of private enterprise from state intervention, without any planning or direction in the general interest. The classical economists failed to foresee that private enterprise was as capable of erecting hampering monopolies as was government, and would use the machinery of national states for its own ends. They also failed to understand that the state was the greatest economic entity of all, and was capable of remedying disproportions and failures of equilibrium that were bound to arise from the frictions of a practice that was far from being in perfect alignment with their theory.

The remedy is not to try once more to reduce the state to impotence, relying on automatism in the private search for profits, but to use government productively, supplying the deficiencies of private enterprise on the one hand, and on the other establishing the kind of framework within which its operations may beneficially be carried on. This means not merely negative measures such as abolishing the barriers to trade by tariff treaties and the like. It means positive action to see that an orderly development of the world's resources takes place, and that an equitable distribution of the product is made, both among nations and among the income classes within nations.

There is general agreement as to the failures of performance in the recent past. The greatest of these is concerned with the process of investment. First of all, there was not enough of it to keep production expanding and provide full employment in the industrial nations, in view of our habits of "saving," that is, of withdrawing money from the stream of payments rather than spending it all for current goods and services. Not until governments began investing in war did our real capacity for production and employment become evident. The lack of full employment, in turn, deprived the less industrialized regions of markets for their agricultural and mineral products. Meanwhile, not enough was invested in those regions to build the means of supplying their own populations with a decent life.

The money that was invested often was devoted to the wrong uses. Sometimes it was spent for unproductive purposes, in the form of political subsidies or governmental loans that in the end merely created impossible balances of payments and defaults. Sometimes it was concentrated too much in merely extractive industries, with the effect of drawing out of the "back-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward" regions their natural wealth, with no corresponding benefit to the inhabitants, who were subject to cruel exploitation in the process. And it gave rise to grave international frictions, both among the exploiting nations and between them and the exploited.

The second great fault had to do with free and equal access to the world's resources. By this we do not mean that natural riches should be distributed gratis to everybody. But monopoly, political and economic, tried to gain undue advantage from control over them. The struggle for colonies is, in its economic aspect, merely a struggle for exclusive privilege in the exploitation of resources and markets. Aside from mere political control, though often complicated with it, international cartels applied monopoly methods to restrict production in order to plunder the consumers. Sometimes, in the recent worldwide contraction of economic activity, restriction of output was a last desperate resort of bankrupt producers.

A third complex of economic headaches in international affairs had to do with upset balances of payments, wide fluctuations of the exchange values of currencies, devaluation of currencies themselves, and the interrelated barriers to trade such as exchange blocking, bi-party barter agreements and the like. It is the fashion among economic conservatives to speak of these obstructions as if they were the prime cause of international economic sickness, imposed by the pure cussedness of politicians. As a matter of fact, they resulted largely from such deeper maladjustments as those mentioned above, though they did aggravate the general disease in the effort to obtain immunity for restricted groups.

War necessities and devices have cut square across these obstructions, so that we shall have a chance to make a fresh start even before remobilization for peace begins. New investment has, by governmental programs, been pushed to the limit of productive capacity. Even international investment to further the output of strategic materials has been made on a planned basis by such agencies as the Export-Import Bank and the Board of Economic Warfare. Lease-Lend has taken needed materials wherever they were available and sent them wherever they could be put to the best use. It is true that the ends now in view are far from desirable in a peaceful world economy and will have to be drastically revised. But the United Nations are operating a world economy so far as their jurisdiction extends, and they can continue to operate it, by a skillful adaptation of the methods now at work, for the objectives that will be desirable after the war is won.

Already the principle is established that relief follows close on the rearguards of our armies. But what is to follow relief? Even if we were rich enough to go on feeding and clothing a large part of the world indefinitely, that would not produce the kind of world we want. Production and exchange must be built up again. But if we are not ready with the framework about which it can best be built, we shall have missed a unique opportunity to organize the world for peace.

It is agreed by almost everyone that unless the victors, and, more specifically, the United States and Britain, can maintain an expanding economy and full employment within their own boundaries, the foundation of any international economic order will be missing, since when the leading industrial nations are depressed, the world is depressed. How to do this is a large subject, which I have discussed briefly in a previous article. We shall have to return to it again and again. The present purpose, however, is to suggest the nature and operation of the agencies necessary to complement this domestic endeavor in the international field. Of course it must not be thought that any sharp division can be made between the two subjects; the chain of causation runs both ways.

We need, then, agencies and policies as follows:

1. An international investment agency
   a. To stimulate investment for the purpose of supplying the economic energy for an expanding economy,
   b. To make sure that the investment made is for productive purposes,
   c. To govern the terms of investment so that it does not result in exploitation of populations or create unwieldy balances of payments,
   d. To put an end to competition for control among investing nations, or to conflict between investing nations and "colonial" areas, arising from financial imperialism.

2. A series of development authorities
   a. To receive and administer funds from the investment agency,
   b. To plan and execute large developmental projects which will increase productivity, open up resources, improve nutrition and health,
   c. To provide an adequate social framework for direct private investment and enterprise.

3. An international labor-standards agency
   a. To set up and administer standards of work, wages and social security for internationally financed undertakings,
   b. To continue the improvement of labor standards, begun under the League of Nations, by the drafting of international conventions,
   c. To study and recommend means for improving conditions of health, nutrition and housing.

4. An international trade agency
   a. To supervise cartels and commodity agreements in the interest of the consumer,
   b. To undertake commodity pools whenever necessary to deal with temporary surpluses,
   c. To administer a clearing center for international exchange and to engage in exchange stabilization whenever necessary,
   d. In the event of persistent lack of balance in inter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national payments, to recommend fundamentally remedial measures before currency depreciation is permitted.

e. To cut off supplies from any nation undertaking armament in violation of international agreement.

These may not be all the agencies that will be required, nor is the list of their functions meant to be exhaustive. It goes without saying that each must have a planning staff, and that provision must be made both for unitary control of their administration and for a joint planning body connected with the over-all control. Another article will be required to outline briefly how they could be set up and how they might operate.

It is not too early to prepare for an organization of this kind, and to show that we mean business in fulfilling the promises of the Atlantic Charter to seek freedom from want and worldwide social security.

GEORGE SOULE

The War within the War

WE OVER HERE are wondering what in God's name American diplomacy is driving at. We don't like Darlan.[1] We don't like Franco. We don't like the idea of asking decent men to die if it is only in order to make a new Europe congenial to such as those. Justly or unjustly the American State Department is being given the credit for having brought to our side those latest allies. What does it all mean? Where are we heading? Is it necessary to pay so high a price in order to win this war? And if so, is it still victory? Some people counsel patience. They say, "Learn to play politics the clever way. We are pitting one rat against another. It is all tactics. It is all temporary. Later we shall disinfect our premises." That kind of talk is reminiscent of the stench that rose from some of the super-sophisticated political salons of Paris in the days before Hitler took over. There is no health in it. It is too clever by half. It raises in an acutely painful form the question of what we are fighting for.

There was a time when progressively minded people in Britain looked suspiciously at General de Gaulle. He was not the ideal choice that any Socialist or most liberals would have made if asked to choose a leader for Fighting France. But de Gaulle plodded faithfully on. His name reached the underground movements of France. He became a symbol. One by one the various groups, even Socialist and Communist, accepted him as their rallying point. The British government encouraged him to broadcast to France. Moving speeches were made. Solemn promises were given. Then one day de Gaulle was told he could broadcast no more. Or at least he was told he could not broadcast what he wanted to say. Churchill forbade. A few MP's pressed for an explanation. They were given to understand that de Gaulle was a sacrificial offering laid on the altar of Anglo-American friendship. So, we ask, what in God's name is American diplomacy driving at? Where in this scheme of things does President Roosevelt appear? What substance is there in the idealistic speeches of men like Vice President Wallace?

The war has taken a new turning. With the easing of the military situation all the reactionary forces in Britain have reappeared in full strength. Tory politicians are enjoying the luxury once more of saying what they really mean. They make no secret of the fact that they are fighting two wars in one. They mean to master Hitler. They also mean to strangle at birth all revolutionary movements in Europe. It is for this latter purpose that men like Darlan may be handy. The dictators Hitler and Mussolini are to go. But their nearest spiritual relatives, apparently, are to be installed in their place.

In the first flush of victory, when the news of the African successes reached England, Prime Minister Churchill made a characteristically Tory gesture. He dismissed Cripps from his Cabinet. If Cripps had played his hand strongly in the early spring, he could have dismissed Churchill. But Cripps played the game the gentle way. The reward for his forbearance has now been handed to him. It has been wrapped up in pale blue ribbon and the press has done its part to make demotion sound like promotion. But nobody is really taken in. Churchill is now strong enough to dispense with Cripps. He has not waited a single day before doing so. Cripps may one day make a mighty come-back. But it will have to be mighty indeed, for he has fallen a long way. He has done the one thing that a man in his position cannot afford to do: He has alienated the Left. The Right has no permanent use for him. The Left had great hopes of him. His pre-war and early war record entitled him to be regarded as a uniquely gifted and courageous socialist and anti-fascist. Then Churchill got hold of him. The older and wilier man, by appealing to Cripps's high sense of public duty, prevailed on him to become Leader of the House of Commons. Almost any post would have been less disastrous for Cripps than that. So far as the public could see or hear, he ceased to have any distinctive point of view. He was merely the mouthpiece of the government. He had to present and defend its compromise proposals on India, on coal, on old-age pensions and other contentious issues. With punctilious rectitude he carried out his duties. Friends tried to rouse him to the dangers of his position. He insisted on carrying on.

[1] Miss Lee's article, of course, was written before the assassination of Darlan. — THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the sequel many feel that Cripps has had a shabby deal. In a difficult and complex war situation, requiring national unity, he played the game according to the accepted rules. The difference between the Right and Left in British domestic politics is that the Right talk as if they were engaged in a cricket match, but when the moment for the kill arrives they strike out straight and sure. The Socialists are less ruthless. In action they are almost invariably too soft. They don't believe in hitting a man when he is down. Then when the recipient of their mercy is on his feet again, they look around rather dizzily, slowly adjusting themselves to the fact that they themselves are once more being knocked all around the ring.

A popular talking point of a mellower political kind is the Beveridge Report. We are each and all going to be socially insured in one inclusive government scheme against every misfortune that can befall us from the cradle to the grave. That is the general idea. If implemented, it would make Britain the social-service Mecca of the world. But the private insurance companies object. Some trade unions that give benefits to their members object. It is the old business. All interests are in favor of social progress in the abstract, but hostile to any suggestion that encroaches on their established areas of privilege. There is a rumor that Cripps accepted a departmental portfolio minus Cabinet status, instead of breaking with the government, on the understanding that the report was to have government support.

The elevation of Mr. Herbert Morrison to the Cabinet was no surprise. For some time he has stood high in the favor of the Prime Minister. Someone was badly needed to reply to the critics of the government in Parliamentary debate. As the criticisms come mainly from the Left, a Tory is no use for that purpose. A socialist member was essential. Morrison is famous for his quick wit in debate; for many years at Labor Party conferences he was put up to answer any voice to the left of official policy. The Prime Minister has chosen well. Morrison will be much better than Cripps as a defender of the government when it is attacked by Socialists. Cripps's heart was not in that kind of duty. On such occasions he said his piece competently but quite woodenly. Morrison on the other hand will enjoy himself. He is not a great man and never can be. His talents are antithetical to greatness. But he has considerable versatility. He is an industrious and jolly little Cockney with a great sense of law and order. A Tory prime minister could not hope to have his interests protected by a better type of police officer.

Which all sums up to an admission that those of us in Britain who are seeking to make this an anti-fascist war, not an inter-empire tournament championship, are in the doldrums. There are two Britains as there are two Americas. Our genuinely democratic and progressive halves have a stiff struggle ahead of them if they are to win not only the war against Hitler but the war within the war that has constantly to be waged against the barbarians inside our own gates.

London JENNIE LEE

Will the New Deal Die in Congress?

> I know not how better to describe our form of government in a single phrase than by calling it a government by the chairmen of the standing committees of Congress. – *Woodrow Wilson*

FAR AND AWAY the most important immediate business confronting administration leaders in the new Congress, which convenes January 6 and hears the President's message on the state of the Union the next day, is the filling of vacancies on Senate and House committees created by Democratic defeats in the 1942 election. This is not just routine. It is important—vitally important, as a brief statement of the facts all too clearly shows.

Let us start with the House Ways and Means Committee. As the committee which originates revenue legislation, it is in notable respects the most important committee in either branch of Congress. It is also important because its majority members fill majority vacancies on the other committees. The vacancies on Ways and Means itself are filled by the majority caucus, but after that Ways and Means majority members operate as a committee on committees, so to speak.

If this still doesn't sound like a four-alarm fire, we have only to run our eye down the Democratic membership on Ways and Means in the last Congress and see what happened to it on November 3. My Congressional Directory shows fourteen Democratic members. When the Seventy-eighth Congress meets, seven of these—an even half—will not report for duty.

Southerners such as Chairman Robert L. Doughton of North Carolina and Jere Cooper of Tennessee, will, of course, be back. But John W. Boehne of Indiana and Richard M. Duncan of Missouri, both well advanced in seniority, were defeated for reëlection. So were Knute Hill of Washington and Aaron L. Ford of Mississippi. Raymond S. McKeough gave up his House seat to run for the Senate—and lost. Two other Democratic vacancies result from the death of Frank H. Buck of California and the appointment of Arthur D. Healey of Massachusetts to a federal judgeship.

Now it would seem that it would be a simple matter to obtain new majority members for a committee as important in the conduct of administration affairs as Ways and Means obviously is. Why would not any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democrat be delighted at appointment to the committee which has so large a hand in running the congressional show—and hence the legislative life of the country?

In the first place, there is no way to replace some of the losses. As it happens, the casualties of 1942 include the genuine New Dealers on the committee. All the scouting around that can be done on Capitol Hill will not turn up new progressives with the experience and ability of men like Ray McKeough and Knute Hill. They are out, and the administration has no reserves to take their places. Richard Duncan, one of five Democratic Representatives defeated for reëlection in Missouri, has spent a large part of his decade in the House on revenue problems. What he has learned cannot be passed on to a green member. And while Arthur Healey's appointment puts a New Dealer on the federal bench, it removes a New Dealer from the committee which decides the form our taxes will take.

But that is only part of the trouble. When it comes to getting new members, aside from considerations of experience or whether they are New Dealers or conservative Democrats, another obstacle arises. Many of the eligible Democrats have worked up to the chairmanships of less important committees. If they go to Ways and Means they must give up these chairmanships. If they give up these chairmanships they lose the extra clerks which go with them. The temptation if not too often the rule is to pass up Ways and Means, notwithstanding its importance, in order to retain the prestige of a chairmanship and the additional clerical help which any Senator or Representative can always use.

So the prospect for the majority party on Ways and Means is anything but bright. Unless a patriotic desire to serve manifests itself more strongly than is customary, the Democratic caucus will be reduced to placing inexperienced men on a committee which should have the very best the administration can give it.

What is true of Ways and Means is true to more or less the same extent of all House committees. The House Appropriations Committee also was particularly hard hit. It saw no fewer than three of its members try for the Senate and lose—Joseph E. Casey of Massachusetts, Ross Collins of Mississippi and David D. Terry of Arkansas. Others were defeated for their House seats.

All told there are fifty-five Democratic vacancies on "select" standing committees. Membership on such a committee, under present rules, precludes the service of a Representative on any other committee. In addition to the two House committees already mentioned, these select standing committees are Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs and Post Office and Post Roads. It is doubtful whether the administration forces will be able to fill these vacancies if they retain the one-committee service rule. Here is something for Speaker Rayburn and his leaders to study closely in the next few days.

A loss of nine Democratic seats in the Senate means that the reduction in the majority membership in the upper chamber is proportionately about as great as in the House. Thus many votes which the administration has had on Senate committees will not be there in the new Congress. Control consequently will often be problematical. Take, for example, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Four Democrats in the heart of this important committee were defeated in 1942—James H. Hughes of Delaware for renomination and Prentiss M. Brown of Michigan, Clyde L. Herring of Iowa and William H. Smathers of New Jersey for reëlection. Three of the twelve Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee—one-fourth the majority strength—were defeated. And so it runs throughout the Senate organization generally.

One result of this situation is that it will require the administration to face the facts of November 3 and to plan accordingly. For until now the disposition has been to act pretty much as if nothing happened at the polls. But now the official tabulation is out and it shows that whereas the Republicans did not quite elect a majority in the House their candidates actually polled more votes in the country at large *including the South* than did the Democrats. The percentages are: Republicans, 50.6; Democrats, 47.4; other parties, 2. It is the first time in *fourteen* years that the total Democratic vote for House seats has fallen below the Republican total.

There have been other indications of the extent of the administration's losses. The New Deal leaders got nowhere at all in the final weeks of the old Congress when it came to putting through the so-called third war-powers bill, which President Roosevelt asked on the eve of the election. And perhaps most convincing of all were the pictures which the newspapers printed of Sen. George W. Norris of Nebraska removing the nameplate from his door in the Senate Office Building. The end of "the Grand Old Man's" legislative career in Washington was the proof of a bitter pudding.

The surest result of this congressional-committee situation will be to give the South a much firmer grip on the Democratic Party, as such, at least in the legislative branch. For as the proportion of Northern, Eastern, Middle Western and Western Democrats goes down the proportion of Southern Democrats goes up. This does not need to be all loss. If it will only embolden the Southern conservatives to make good on their threat to withdraw from the Democratic Party we may yet achieve a two-party system significant for its alternatives rather than for its traditions, shibboleths and labels.

IRVING DILLIARD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Waking Up the OCD

When President Roosevelt established the Office of Civilian Defense, on May 20, 1941, he gave a clear mandate. The OCD was to assist in setting up state and local defense councils, in planning and carrying out civil defense programs, planning and promoting "activities designed to mobilize a maximum civilian effort in the prosecution of the war." In other words, the President intended the OCD from its inception to be responsible for keeping informed about state and local problems resulting from the war *and* doing something about them.

When Jim Landis left his post as dean of the Harvard Law School to become Director of the Office of Civilian Defense last February, he moved into the hottest seat in a Washington just then abounding in hot seats. Of all the administrative messes in town, probably the one Fiorello LaGuardia had left to Landis was the most tangled and mangled. Probably it was because he fully appreciated the difficulty a new OCD director would be up against that the President selected Jim Landis for the job. Landis had been up against tough propositions before and his appointment was hailed as a splendid move. Some of those who had known Landis best, however, and who also had a clear view of the job the OCD had in front of it, were not so wholehearted in their approval. Some of us wondered why they frowned and doubted. In the months since we have learned.

Landis silently set about the job of taking the heat off the OCD. Properly putting first things first, he set about bringing some order out of the chaos in which La Guardia had left the civilian-protection program. Old General Gasser, who had been in charge of that program, soon quietly departed to another, less demanding assignment, and numerous other personal shifts were made in that department. The OCD survived the crisis occasioned by having to reverse its own highly publicized instructions for extinguishing incendiary bombs, and by midsummer Landis was reasonably well on top of his protection problem.

During the six months or so while Director Landis was concentrating on the protection part of the OCD program, its other half, the community-mobilization program, languished in neglect. For lack of top direction, little feuds within the organization assumed alarming proportions. For lack of clear directions and clear authority, the Community Mobilization Division was seriously handicapped in its relations with those state and local defense councils which were determined to move forward on this front no more rapidly than they were forced to go. Small-minded bureaucrats established themselves firmly in control of the OCD's mechanisms for reaching out into the country and carrying out the President's mandate "to mobilize a maximum civilian effort in the prosecution of the war and provide opportunities for constructive civilian participation in the war program."

Public-administration expert Frank Bane, who set up the OCD field organization plan originally, had fixed it so that the national OCD staff was seriously handicapped in doing its job. As a strong representative of the "government by compromise" public-administration school of thought, Bane set up a clumsy, slow-moving system based on self-determination for governors and mayors. The governors were Bane's friends through his position as secretary of the Conference of Governors, and the mayors were LaGuardia's friends through his position as head of the Conference of Mayors.

The national OCD office was not free to deal directly with local communities. It must first communicate with the Governor of the state and his defense council, personally selected by him. If they think well of the action the national OCD staff is proposing, they then tell the local defense council and its local head, the mayor, about the idea, and that local group is then free to go ahead with the proposed action if it likes the idea and has the organization and the finances needed.

It is under this administrative structure that the OCD community-mobilization staff has been trying to operate, and that Mr. Landis' national staff has been struggling to carry out the promise Mr. Landis himself made to the American people when he pledged that the OCD will lead in the difficult and enormous task of building an effective system of civilian protection against enemy attack from Maine to San Diego. It will, as it has, "seek to mobilize men and women, to meet whatever problems war has brought us. It will seek to use all this energy in our common fight for the victory of the four freedoms. This calls for the mobilization of all our people to meet the many demands of war. No loyal man and no loyal woman is outside this war effort. They can and must be used if we are to win through as a strong, unified, democratic nation."

And, most significantly, he added: "The Executive accomplish the task specifically placed upon the Office has the responsibility of creating machinery that will of Civilian Defense."

That Mr. Landis has failed to do.

He has tolerated overcaution and compromise as the philosophy of his Division of Operations. He has allowed this heart of his program to be manipulated by two ambitious young politicians, Hugh Jackson of New York and Walter Finke, Harold Stassen's representative in Washington. He has allowed their unwillingness to take an aggressive stand to balk his own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressed policy of providing greater representation to labor, Negroes, consumers and other vitally important groups which have been excluded from membership on defense councils in far too many localities. He has allowed the reaction radiating from many of the state and local defense councils set up under the Bane system to influence the character of his community-mobilization program to a greater extent than his community-mobilization program influenced American communities.

In other words, Jim Landis has fallen into bad hands.

There are people in the OCD who understand what it was intended to be and who have tried to make those intentions reality. They have formulated and tried to push through plans for making the OCD a people's program. They have worked out child care, nutrition, recreation, conservation, transportation, health, housing, salvage and many other projects, and they have done their best to see to it that information about how to get such projects into operation, and assistance in putting them into operation, reached local communities. In many instances some information on some of these subjects has found its way to local communities. But far too often, the inertia of non-representative state and local defense councils has stymied the timid OCD operations staff and formed an effective bloc against the full mobilization of civilians which the President ordered the OCD to bring about.

Clearly, thus far, the OCD has failed in its task of community mobilization. Clearly, it has failed not because Dean Landis has not understood his job or tried to do it. He has. The trouble has been that Landis' intent and in many cases his specific instructions have been confused and violated by people within his own organization who had their own ideas about what to do and how to do it. In the last few weeks some of the principal offenders have left the OCD. Their leaving has brought new hope to those who still think that Jim Landis can do the job the President has given him to do, if he will be a little more careful about the people with whom he surrounds himself and a little more vigilant in his supervision of their actions.

However, this new hope has already suffered one dash of cold water. The important job of Director of the Community Mobilization Program, left vacant in the weeks since journalist Jonathan Daniels resigned, was filled by a thoroughly questionable choice. For the job of turning the OCD into a people's program, with a job for every man and woman to do in his own community, Landis selected Reginald Foster, of Boston, whose principal experience has been as European representative of the Bankers' Trust Company of New York and for ten years as London representative of Spencer, Trask and Company. Mr. Foster is a well mannered gentleman with a well modulated voice who obviously has for some years had little opportunity to observe or participate in American life west of Boston and New York. Undoubtedly, Mr. Foster will do his best to mobilize all Americans and to turn the OCD into a real people's program, but presumably Mr. Foster will have to do all this in terms of his experience among Boston Brahmins and Wall Street bankers. It will be interesting to see how applicable a program thus conceived will be to Butte and Kankakee, Amarillo and Tuskaloosa. Mr. Foster believes that the OCD should be a "traffic cop" to see to it that things run smoothly. But he hastens to explain that responsibility for doing anything about anything rests entirely with the governors and the mayors. In other words Mr. Foster conceives of himself as a traffic cop, but as a peculiar kind of traffic cop, one who has no power to give anybody a ticket, who probably doesn't even wear a badge or a uniform, and who can blow his whistle only when he has permission to do so.

All over America citizens are still crying out, "What can I do to help win the war?" Landis himself and many of the strong members of his staff know a great many good answers to this question. But Landis has not built a means of communication for telling his answers to the American people nor for helping them carry out whichever of the alternative courses of action they decide upon. If the OCD is to be forged into a real tool for mobilizing every civilian for total war, there will have to be some changes made. All the nonsense about "federal-state-local relationships" will have to be passed over in favor of a direct line of communication between the OCD general staff and the civilian leaders in every city and county.

The state and local defense councils must be removed from the political arena into which politically minded mayors and governors have plunged them and transformed into democratic bodies, representative of all the people in the area served.

The OCD must assume its rightful responsibility for filling the gaps in our present program, initiating new programs to meet unmet needs as well as coördinating present activities of various agencies.

Civilian protection and civilian mobilization must be properly financed. That means federal aid. With that federal aid for the purchase of materials, payment of salaries and expenses, the operation of training programs and other such necessities, should go a set of minimum standards for local performance equivalent to the minimum standards now operative in the social-security field.

During his time as head of the OCD, Landis has too often taken bad advice—fence-sitting advice. He is not the only one in Washington who has been following this path. It leads to the same place for him that it is leading and has led to for all the others. When we need statesmanship, must we have mere administration? When we need courage and frank leadership, must we have equivocation and faintheartedness?

Washington HELEN FULLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The Trial of the Viereckites

THE ISOLATIONISTS in Congress are never satisfied. They have all stayed out of jail and other public institutions and most of them came through the last election in full possession of their seats. One might expect these achievements to be enough for them, considering how they helped George Sylvester Viereck, the Nazi propagandist, use Congress as a self-sustaining arm of Dr. Goebbels' Ministry of Public Enlightenment. But no, they are now determined to keep their non-congressional friends out of jail too.

They are too late, of course, to keep some of them out. Viereck himself, for example, is serving a term for failure to comply fully with the law requiring agents of foreign governments to register with the State Department and supply pertinent information about their activities. George Hill, former secretary to Rep. Hamilton Fish, is doing a stretch for perjury because of his reluctance to tell a federal grand jury that he served as Viereck's agent at the Capitol. Viereck and Hill, together with twenty-six other assorted characters, some in jail and some at large on bail, are currently awaiting trial on an indictment charging them with conspiracy to undermine the morale of the armed forces. The government expects to prove at the trial that all of the accused twenty-eight were connected directly or indirectly with Viereck's propaganda mill.

Viereck, who had been an able and notorious German propagandist during the First World War, cultivated friends in Congress when he saw the Second World War coming on. His best friend in the Senate was the late Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota; in the House, Fish of New York. Lundeen was persuaded not only to make speeches in the Senate propounding the Viereck thesis that the United States should, at all cost, remain friendly with Germany but to become chairman of a Viereck-financed isolationist organization whose primary function was to mail out copies of these speeches. Fish, meanwhile, was induced to lend Viereck the services of Hill to arrange for wholesale mailing of speeches by other isolationists like Rep. Stephen Day of Illinois, whose book had been published by Viereck's publishing company. Presently Hill was sending out speeches through a score of organizations and individuals, buying copies at cost from the Public Printer and mailing them postage-free under congressional frank. The country was littered with these excerpts from The Congressional Record. All told, the story Goebbels and Viereck wanted Americans to hear bore the imprint of congressional sanction and came in impressive official envelopes.

Among the most popular numbers was a speech by Rep. Clare Hoffman of Michigan called "Roosevelt Is a Judas." Thousands of copies were sent out by Hill to editors of little anti-Semitic Middle Western sheets and remailed by the editors to their subscribers. Gerald Winrod, the Kansas Führer, was one of the publishers who particularly fancied this Hoffman effort. Prescott Dennett, operating secretary of the Viereck-Lundeen organization, also liked this one and made use of it. Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling of Chicago, author of "The Red Network," liked it too.

Ever since these main facts first became known following a raid on Dennett's home, where mail sacks full of speeches were found by the grand jury's agents, Fish, Hoffman and others less directly involved have been hollering about persecution. Wrapping themselves in congressional immunity and professions of ignorance about Viereck's connection with their own activities, Fish and Hoffman have taken turns explaining things to the House. Fish's first speech on the subject recounted substantially the same story which, when told by Hill to the grand jury, became the basis for a perjury charge. Hoffman has repeatedly tangled himself in misstatements.

If the isolationists were content to leave bad enough alone, that would be the situation today. The indicted twenty-eight, among them Viereck, Hill, Winrod, Dennett and Mrs. Dilling, would be tried in due course and convicted or acquitted. But evidence now accumulating suggests a concerted effort to intimidate the Justice Department and the courts. The object seems to be to force Attorney General Francis Biddle to move for dismissal of the indictment or, failing this, to prejudice in advance any court that can be assembled in the District of Columbia. This is not the exclusive project of Fish and Hoffman. It has enlisted such former isolationist figures as Sen. Burton K. Wheeler of Montana and Robert Taft of Ohio. Both have written letters to Biddle challenging the validity of the indictment and then releasing their letters for publication. Wheeler, in his letter to Biddle, called the prosecution "one of the most disgraceful proceedings ever carried out in this country." In releasing his letter, Taft said said he had never received a reply from Biddle. Actually, Biddle answered within a week, explaining that the evidence had been reviewed by a committee of Justice Department attorneys and found to be more than enough to support the indictment.

Besides writing to Biddle, Taft wrote a letter to Winrod declaring the government's methods in the case "enough to justify disbarment of the government attorneys." Winrod immediately used the Taft letter in an appeal for a defense fund, and apparently did well with it. Mrs. Myrtle F. Flowers, his secretary, was indicted for perjury this month after refusing to answer questions about the disposition of the proceeds. Dennett, now a draftee, has been using his free-mailing privilege as a soldier to canvass his sucker list for contributions.

Recently The Washington Times-Herald, the not-very-bright voice of isolationism in the Capital, let more cats out of the bag. It reported that certain influential but unnamed members of the House Rules Committee were planning an investigation of the Justice Department's handling of the sedition case with emphasis on the charge that William Power Maloney, Assistant Attorney General, accepted help from the Anti-Defamation League, a Jewish organization, and the Union for Democratic Action while preparing its case against the Viereckites. So the idea apparently is to use a committee of Congress to befuddle the processes of justice with anti-Semitic sound effects in order to protect congressional members of the neutrality cabal from further exposure.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Children's War

IN AMERICAN FILMS of the past year there has been a sturdy trend toward a more mature appraisal of personality and behavior in our society. It probably started with the unhoneyed treatment of Citizen Kane's life. "King's Row," for all its indulgences, treated sadism in medicine as well as insanity. "The Moon and Sixpence" showed the clear superiority of a social rebel over the convention-bound lives around him. "The Male Animal" glossed it over, but it was against the Gene Talmadges in the scholastic world and recognized the feelings of an intellectual. "Now, Voyager" considered the mother as the root of a severe neurosis and advocated a kind of psychoanalysis. This brave new movie world continues in "Journey for Margaret," which attempts to show the appalling psychological effects of a war on small children, not as poor little things and sure box-office, but as ill human beings.

The children are seen in a nursery during the height of the German raids in 1940. War correspondent Robert Young comes to get a story, meets the refugee doctor, Fay Bainter, standing probably for Anna Freud, the child psychiatrist. Miss Bainter shows him her roomsful of shocked children: the little girl who screams at the sight of a man, the boy who retreats from the world to his woolly lamb, the girl who constantly jerks her head up and down, Margaret, who has a compulsive gesture of wiping the corners of her eyes and cannot be parted from her "imagesium" bomb. The scene of the little boy, clutching his lamb and saying over and over, meaninglessly, some magic phrases, is pretty subtle for movies. Mr. Young is impressed, and so are you, for the most part. The two central children have some difficult assignments—the writing here is good—and they almost reach the convincing physical and emotional derangement demanded of them, though stealing glances at the director often enough and walking so painstakingly as to keep you jittery. In some of these scenes the camera acts as an interested onlooker and a sustained one; so that you can watch the child's behavior for long sequences. Margaret O'Brien, a professional seven-year-old, with a dark, oval, fiery face and a wonderful hat like Picasso's clowns, has a way of blurting her words suddenly and emphatically, like a delayed bomb. The other child, William Severn, is better when he is not just being cuddly.

As a rule, in psychiatric movies, the further the picture gets from the hospital and case histories the worse it is, and "Journey for Margaret" is excruciatingly true to this form. It has a love story about Robert Young and Laraine Day, which is ghostlike in comparison to the children's home. They and their subplot do strange things the movie doesn't prepare you sufficiently for. Miss Day has a way of turning on smiles, intoxication or pain so extremely and fast as to leave you behind. The psychology of the husband and wife is all right, except that it is shown as inadequately as a mountain-climb would be by showing the climber at the top of the peak. The writing of their speeches is terrible ("Oh, God! Gimme the strength and wisdom to stay mad!") That one was so embarrassing for everybody they pityingly turned the light off Young's face when he said it.

The intentions of this movie are admirable, but it has the unforgivable fault of talking down to the audience. One's natural response to the bombing, if only for its effect on the children, is substantial enough without the set speeches about Rotterdam. But worse is the tendency to turn aside from the serious effect of the movie with something easily recognizable, perhaps to be laughed at, such as Young's four chair-squeaking scenes and the Japanese envoy, in fear that you might forget that movies are your best entertainment. It is a good movie only when it is about the children.

MANNY FARBER

Europe Underground

THE underground movement in Czecho-Slovakia has ceased to use the letter V for propaganda purposes. The letter B, standing for Benes, and a five-pointed star, representing Russian victory, are now the symbols of revolt. They recently appeared everywhere one morning—on billboards, walls, buildings and sidewalks.

From Berlin comes an announcement by the SS police chief at the Military Commander's Office in France of a modification of the hostage system in France. Henceforth reprisals for acts of sabotage will be directed against the relatives of saboteurs who are not surrendered within ten days. The penalties are as follows: Male relatives in direct line, brothers-in-law and cousins over eighteen will be shot; all female relatives of corresponding categories will be sentenced to forced labor; all children up to the age of eighteen of the men and women affected by these measures will be sent to disciplinary institutions.

New commanders have been installed in the Grini concentration camp in Norway and the severity of the camp regime has been increased. Prisoners are no longer permitted to read books (including Bibles), to play cards or checkers. Among those held at Grini are two Lutheran clergymen and a Catholic priest. These three were severely reprimanded recently for having held church services in the barracks. The priest had been punished the day before, for a different reason, and was then dismissed. The other clergymen were tortured with a long period of penal gymnastics. When, lying on the ground and ordered to perform the "push-up" with their arms, they could not raise their bodies, guards ground their faces into the mud with their feet.

The newspaper Svenska Dagbladet, Stockholm, reports that tuberculosis is heavily increasing in Norway, a result of lack of food and bad hygienic conditions.

An express train taking a German staff and SS troops to the eastern front was derailed on the Berlin-Königsberg line. Many were killed. A reward of 100,000 marks has been offered for the capture of the saboteurs.

The Swedish newspaper Ny Dag reports a great increase in railroad accidents in Sweden, a result of faulty freight cars brought into the country in the course of German-Swedish trade. Eskilstuna Kuriren, another Swedish newspaper, notes that "Very few people realize how enormously the stoppage of shipping along the European coast is obstructing the Axis war effort," and testifies to the effectiveness of British air attacks on German railroads.

The Litzmannstadter Zeitung reports the sentencing to death by a special court in Wloclawek, Poland, of a Polish girl of twenty-three, Zofja Dominiak, who slapped the face of her German employer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

When Clare [Luce] was talking about her constituents in Connecticut, I thought for a minute I was back in London chatting with Nancy Astor. – *From Hedda Hopper's syndicated column.*

Your correspondent came away feeling quite well satisfied with the production as a whole. Mr. Gielgud's own playing of the name part lit up though it was with imagination and intelligence, was not memorable. . . . There can be no excuse . . . for the ineffectiveness of Gwen Ffrangcon-Davies (Lady Macbeth) except that she ought not to have been cast to play a woman so far outside her normal range. . . . Then we come to the settings. . . . I found them, frankly, hideous." – *London letter in the Sunday drama section of The New York Times.*

Miss Betty Hunter, 4011 N. W. 11th Ave., appeared in city court Thursday as the driver of a car that mowed down three corporals, seriously injuring one of them, in a dimout zone at N. Miami Ave. and 17th Ter. Tuesday night.

Miss Hunter testified that she left the scene of the accident because her mother had told her that when anything happened to come straight home and confide in her. – *From The Miami Daily News.*

In the utmost sincerity and with no intention of being sacrilegious, I want to suggest that, next to our daily supplication to the Creator for victory and peace, the most fervent silent prayer in the hearts of the majority of Americans today be:

"Almighty God, have mercy on a patient and long-suffering people—and give us a bachelor President in 1944." – *Subscriber's letter to Liberty magazine.*

War Is Heck

In "Bombardier," which has reached the RKO cutting rooms, a Japanese is referred to as a "louse." The Hays office last week notified the studio that the word is forbidden and suggested "stinkbug" as a substitute. – *From The New York Times.*

Total-War Department

We may have been caught short of rubber when the Japs moved into the Dutch East Indies, but the United States supply of Sumatra leaf for wrapping cigars, the finest in the world for that purpose, is sufficient for the next couple of years. – *Neal O'Hara in The New York Post.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

"The Education of Wendell Willkie"

SIR: Your article, "The Education of Wendell Willkie" [October 26], is a masterful statement by Max Lerner of a major development in our political history. That Mr. Willkie has gained tremendously in stature and significance cannot be denied. That his metamorphosis from leadership of reaction, privilege and money power, to leadership in the cause of human rights and human dignity should cause much wonder is also quite natural. Mr. Willkie has always appealed a little more to us than have others from his former camp. His opinions never seemed quite so crystallized in a fatuous contentment with the status quo as some other of his former friends. We are watching him with hope and intense interest. If he continues and advocates putting his democratic and humanitarian ideals into effect here at home as well as in the abstract international sphere he may even make a good President. In the meantime we will watch him closely and with much hope. He may have something we need.

Olaa, Hawaii F. B. HOFFMANN

The Case of Dr. Levine

SIR: In this war between fascism and the democracies, each side is using as never before the latest results of science and technology. On our side, complete involvement of scientific personnel is, as yet, far from achieved. The problem is agitating scientists throughout the country and is being discussed in the scientific press and acted upon by various scientific societies. It involves organization, but primarily also the attitude of our leading scientists and of the dominant scientific bodies.

A case in which reactionary prejudice has resulted in the failure to use highly skilled and greatly needed scientific knowledge is that of Dr. Samuel Levine, a brilliant and outstanding young physicist of Toronto, Canada. Despite the great demand for physicists and physical chemists that exists as a result of the war effort, Dr. Levine's unquestionable abilities, which have resulted in fundamental contributions in these fields, have been idle for two years. His efforts to obtain employment have been fruitless, as was an attempt to joint the scientific staffs of the Canadian armed forces.

Dr. Levine's plight is due to the circumstance that, in September, 1940, two men who had rented a room in his home were arrested as Communists by the Canadian police. Pamphlets, whose ownership was admitted by the two men, were found in the house and Dr. Levine was charged with their possession. On the basis of this inadequate evidence, a police magistrate sentenced Dr. Levine to six months' imprisonment and the sentence was carried out in spite of protests by leading scientists in Canada, Great Britain and the United States. When this term was over, Dr. Levine was immediately taken by the Mounted Police and interned "for the duration." Increased protests then led to the appointment of an Advisory Committee which recommended Dr. Levine's unconditional release, and he was freed in October, 1941. Since that time, Dr. Levine has been without means of livelihood and without the opportunity to participate, as he eagerly wishes to do, in the war effort of his country.

The University of Toronto, where Dr. Levine was Research Associate (1939-40) and Fellow (1940-41) in Geophysics, although I am informed that it is carrying on a considerable geophysical research and in spite of strong support by a number of distinguished professors, has not found it expedient to reëmploy Dr. Levine.

Dr. Levine's case is generally admitted to have been a miscarriage of justice. It is being transformed from an accidental

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wartime error into a serious injustice, detrimental not only to Dr. Levine and to his family, but to the larger social welfare. An important scientist, whose work could contribute significantly to the war effort of the United Nations, is forced to sit idly by at a time when society urgently needs his special abilities in the life and death struggle of our world.'

DR. HARRY GRUNDFEST, National Secretary,
American Association of Scientific Workers

Long Island City, N. Y.

Reading for Soldiers

SIR: This evening at the Post Exchange I encountered the following assortment of magazines: Mystery Detective, Intimate Detective, Actual, Official, Sensational, Master, Headquarters, Gripping, Real, Crime, Feature, True, Confidential, Dynamic, National, Inside, Crack, Big Detective, Crime Confessions and The Shadow Annual.

Miami Beach, Fla. PVT. HENRY BENNETT

P. S.: There are also: Exposé, Headline, Complete and National Detective—twenty-four in all, so far, according to my count.

P. P. S.: Plus—just discovered—Spotlight, Secret, Front Page, Startling, Daring, Exclusive Detective and True Crime Mysteries (new high—thirty-one).

"A Conrad Argosy"

SIR: Mr. McFee is right [The New Republic, December 14] in supposing that I was unaware that "A Conrad Argosy" was got up as a "Book Club Dividend" and that he enlisted in the enterprise as a "hired" blurb-writer. There was no indication whatsoever on or in my copy of the book to show that it was published as such. Apparently I made the mistake of taking it to be a serious edition of Conrad and Mr. McFee's preface as a serious performance. I usually expect to find hired blurbs on a book's jacket, not inside its covers. But since I *did* call his preface a blurb and ascribe to it the loose talk and misinformation we are accustomed to find in blurbs, I can't see what Mr. McFee is complaining about. His self-imposed mission of "rescuing" Conrad—whether from professors or anyone else—by such methods is one on whose "patronizing" features Conrad himself held sufficiently heated and indignant opinions, frequently expressed in his letters and prefaces. (*Cf.* "Indeed, the nature of my writing runs the risk of being obscured by the nature of my material. I admit it is natural; but only the appreciation of a special personal intelligence can counteract the superficial appreciation of the inferior intelligence of the mass of readers and critics." "Life and Letters," II, 316. "This damned sea business keeps off as many people as it gathers in." *Ibid.*, 321. ". . . a work of art is very seldom limited to one exclusive meaning and not necessarily tending to a definite conclusion. And this for the reason that the nearer it approaches art, the more it acquires a symbolic character. . . . All great creations of literature have been symbolic, and in that way have gained in complexity, in power, in depth and in beauty." *Ibid.*, 205, etc., etc.) And when it comes to patronizing Conrad by hired and sentimental misrepresentations of his genius and intention (a mission which Mr. McFee's novels seem to share with his blurbs), I would suggest that perhaps there may be a few among Mr. McFee's 200,000 Book Club readers who are intelligent enough to feel patronized also, to read Conrad for themselves, and to share his resentment more vigorously than I was able to do in the space at my disposal.

Space also prevents me from dealing adequately with Mr. H. J. Barrett's "eclectic, even dialectical, situation"—namely, "that the pluralistic dynamics of the teleology . . . postulate a certain irrefragable distortion of the logistics of the problem which can only be termed the epistemological semantics of the Zeitgeist"—however certain he is that the "categorical imperative . . . could so helpfully elucidate" it. I am quite content to leave him to the consolations of that solution, merely pausing to observe that a paragraph which begins by fearing that I am "unaware" of the "situation" and ends by being "confident" that I "comprehend" it, is sufficiently dialectic, semantical, teleological and self-canceling to exempt me from the problem of struggling with the matter at all.

Chicago, Ill. MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL

Radio Strawberry

SIR: While the drive against obnoxious radio advertising is on, let us call attention, rather, to some that we can tolerate. I nominate as model of the year an "ad" I have heard for over five years; always brief, using one or two short sentences, the wording practically the same, so that it stays in the mind. One is spared repetitions *ad nauseam* and the interruption to the program is negligible.

If I were a beer-drinker instead of the teetotaler I happen to be, I would, because of this ad, certainly follow the example of "taste-wise Texans" and always say "Bottle of Pearl, please," as I have heard it over WOAI at 10 p.m., CWT, for 1,694 times.

A word to the wise ad-man should be sufficient.

Jackson, Miss. AGNES F. RICKETTS

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Inspired by the editorial paragraph in The New Republic of November 3 on the need for federal aid to education, Meg Barden of Belfield, North Dakota, writes to describe the inadequacies of the public schools in the region where she lives. According to her letter, North Dakota schools provide neither free books nor free pencils, and the only requirements for applicants for teaching positions are that they shall be over seventeen years of age and shall have graduated from high school.

Clarence Armstrong writes from Baltimore to criticize the article by Bruce Bliven in The New Republic of December 21, "Where Do We Go from Here?" He thinks Mr. Bliven is much too optimistic and is engaging in wishful thinking. President Roosevelt's political actions, in Mr. Armstrong's opinion, "have been marked by zigzags to the Left and Right, and those to the Right were largely actions that surrendered to the 'economic royalists' nearly everything they could want and those to the Left were largely talk which was not backed by actions." Mr. Armstrong thinks the President should realize it does no good to try to appease the forces of the Right and that he has made a mistake in turning over "the whole defense set-up to his political and economic enemies." In Mr. Armstrong's judgment, conservatives like those in the National Association of Manufacturers want no "people's revolution" and are likely to get their way. He feels it is a mistake to spend attention on panaceas like the Beveridge Report when all the people need is full employment at good wages.

Meeting in biennial session in December, the Federal Council of Churches adopted a statement roundly condemning anti-Semitism and endorsed the suggestion that the feeding of the Greek civilian population be extended to include the other occupied countries of Europe.

After having been prevented for some months from obtaining time on the air, the Coöperative League of the United States of America has reached an agreement with the Code Committee of the National Association of Broadcasters whereby coöperative societies will in future be permitted to buy time provided they make no attack on other forms of business enterprise or system of distribution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School
Springfield, S. Dak.

Marginalia

WITH THE NEW YEAR coming and not many books being published, I looked over my scrawled notes for 1942. Here are some of the entries that I found:

April 2. – A minor result of this war should be the discrediting of all politicians and political theorists who claim to be realistic. They use the word in a special sense that has to be defined. It is realistic to be cynical, selfish and false to one's friends. It is realistic to believe that others are equally selfish and infinitely more stupid. It is realistic to disregard principles and have no sympathy for other people's troubles. It is, on the other hand, unrealistic to act boldly or believe in anything, even victory.

The realists are those who yield gracefully to what they think is superior force. They are those who believe that nothing will really change. And, curiously, they are the men who have been proved wrong in every crisis—they are or were Baldwin, Chamberlain, Sir Nevile Henderson, Sir John Simon; they are Flandin, Bonnet, Laval; they are all the people who lost their shirts for fear of risking them. Hitler is no realist, by their standards. He has fantastic beliefs and acts on them; he thinks he can change the world; he takes risks and wins battles, and he will be defeated only by other unrealists, fighting for a more human cause.

June 12. – There may come a time when even schoolchildren are taught to recognize those qualities of the 1920's and 1930's that writers as a class have so far signally failed to convey. Until recently they have clung to the old conventions that placed romance in the past and preferably in distant lands. Thus, stories of swordplay were centered round the court of Louis XIII, stories of sophistication and decay were eighteenth-century, stories of political plotting were placed in St. Petersburg under the Tsars, as were psychological novels of corruption; and intrigues were something that happened at the court of Graustark. It did not matter that all these qualities and events had recurred in twentieth-century Europe—the cape-and-sword romances, the intrigues, the treachery, the secret police, the spies in a network through every political organization, the psychological grandeur and decay, as well as the greatest massacres since the days of the Mongol hordes. The prevailing literary form was still the petty-bourgeois realistic novel—called realistic because hardly anything happened in it, except that some family made or lost a fortune and some artist or business man got divorced and remarried. Even in America, that sort of life has come to be a historical curiosity. Perhaps the novels that express our time will not be written until after the year 2000.

August 17. – On rereading Hart Crane, it seems to me that although he assumes the role of a prophet and speaks in a prophet's voice, essentially he has nothing to prophesy. What he gives us is intensity of language and feeling, but without many objects of feeling. At heart he believed in nothing, not even himself. "Hasten while they are true—sleep, death, desire," he wrote in one of his finest poems, the second of the "Voyages." And when he mentioned spring flowers, in another poem, they immediately became promises that would never be fulfilled: they were the "twanged red *perfidies* of spring."

August 24. – Not a little of the modern verse that readers find hard to understand is written on a Surrealist principle that I found stated in an essay by Nicholas Calas. "The laws of the combination of images," he says, "constitute the *form of poetry;* the movement of images is *rhythm.*" Poetry written on this principle is likely to have no other form, no other rhythm and no melody whatsoever. Here, for example, are a few lines chosen at random from one of the New Directions anthologies:

(1) He sold his knee-caps for sailboats on galloping waves
of aces.

(2) Sun withered this crucible head,
Wove me by a tragical loom.
Seven moons heard of my coming.

Grew in your wrist like a lady-limbed spear.
(3) The melted harp you inhaled with your ear

(1) is by Oscar Williams, who is usually better than in this sample; (2) is by Lawrence Durrell, who is sometimes worse; and (3) is the result of a collaboration between Charles Henri Ford and Parker Tyler, though I don't doubt that either of them could have written it unaided. But what do the authors matter?—considering that verse like this bears the signature of a literary period now ending, rather than that of any personality or even any nation. Some of it might have been written by a foreigner with the aid of a non-pronouncing English dictionary. And even the images, on which everything else is made to depend—the knee-caps sold for sailboats, the melted harp, the crucible head that was woven on a loom—are so mixed and momentary that they leave no picture in one's mind. They suggest a group of Salvador Dali pictures that had gone through a fire and had been so begrimed that one could no longer distinguish the nightmares they were intended to portray.

October 9. – There are times when the whole game of literature seems repetitious and silly. Everything in the *avant-garde* magazines is something you read twenty years ago, or even something you wrote. Every new writer seems to be cast of old metal in a second-hand mold. At such times you seem to recognize them all—the young man being superior to W. H. Auden yet secretly impressed by him (it used to be Eliot who was treated in that fashion); the book reviewer glancing down his nose at all successful writers, even the good ones; the young woman talking about "the literary temperament" when what she means and what she suffers from is simple narcissism; the boy with terrible manners who everybody says is really quite sensitive, it's just that he's embarrassed (when the right word is self-centered)—they are not so much people as standardized types; the names don't matter. There even comes a moment when other names are equally indifferent, having only the value of counters in a game; when Auden in 1942 equals Eliot in 1920 and Kafka equals Joyce, because they are admired in the same fashion; when all the idolatries and sneers and quarrels seem unutterably known;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the words change but the ambitions and the vanity behind them are eternal. Then, at this moment which is perhaps the foreshadowing of age, you read a poem expressing a real emotion that nobody else has put into words; or a story by some unknown author who has used his eyes and his heart while forgetting to follow the fashionable models; and once again you believe that the long apprenticeship, the disappointments, the situations continually recurring, the people who are types while believing they are special souls—that all these have somehow been justified by a clear and lasting song, the tower rising over the rubble of our days. MALCOLM COWLEY

Books in Review

For Edmund Wilson

POETRY, I suppose, is a sort of side-issue with Edmund Wilson; but, by God, how much better his side-show is than some people's main event! When he and I are both in our graves, some *fin-de-siècle* bright young man may discover and allege that his Axel's Castles and Finland Stations, his Triple Thinkers and Wounds and Bows, were to the work he was meant to do as Housman's editions of Manilius were to his unwritten poems; that he was so good a critic only because he should have been a poet; that, lacking this belief in himself, he had to take off always from other men; that in his essay on poetry's dwindling functions, he was drawing the bow to disguise his own wound. The thesis will be challenged, no doubt; and there will be quite a controversy about it in the pages of The Nation and The New Republic.

Be that as it may, here we have certain "Note-Books of Night,"[1] subtitled, so the jacket tells us, though the book does not, elegies, reveries and satire. It is a good enough over-all subtitle, though there are some items that defy classification under any one of these categories; and the line between elegies and reveries is not too sharp. Satire alone, if the word could be understood in its old Roman sense of miscellany, would describe the contents as well.

The satirical poems in the collection—satirical, in our sense of the word—can be subdivided into two groups, the literary and the political. Here again there is some fusion: certainly "Disloyal Lines to an Alumnus," "Response of the Gentle Scholars" and even the celebrated "Omelet of A. MacLeish" are not without political implications. Of all the satires, the least happy seem to me the two anti-Stalinist poems—perhaps from prejudice; perhaps, I would prefer to think, because the hatred they express seems rather frantic, and the tone too much like that against which they are directed. But "The Three Limperary Cripples," "Bishop Praxed's Apology" and "The Extrovert of Walden Pond" are great fun; one has the impression that Wilson chuckled to himself as he wrote them; and this gusto and zest, this sense of delight, are infectious. There is, too, in the other satirical pieces enough *saeva indignatio* to give edge and point to the urbanity and ease. *Molle atque facetum.*

Prosody aside, elegiac poetry has been defined as that which is mournful, meditative and short; there is the hint of a flute accompaniment not too far away. Except for a few satirical poems, the first part of "Note-Books of Night" consists of elegiac pieces. One or two are embarrassing or awkward; "Home to Town: Two Highballs," for example; and the reader who likes to drift along with a mood, taking things rather easy, is a little confused, if not distressed, when an untitled poem, as on page 15, seems at first reading to be a continuation of the one that starts on the facing page. These elegies, as is proper, concern themselves mainly with the past: houses decaying, loves nearly forgotten, change creeping over things. They are nostalgic without being sentimental; sad without being glum; apprehensive without being hysterical. Their tone is consistent; the language has a somber cadence. "Death lies underneath/that cuts the world away." They face also the fact of sickness: the time's—"This is the zero hour—all troubles and all blurs—/The will is lulled and falters, the dog desire stirs" are the opening lines of the introductory poem; and the individual's—the section closes on this reproach:

> I am alive, and they are dead.
> Yet, slothful and perverse, I slight,
> Between the liquor and the bed,
> Dull morning and tormented night,
> This little work that buys the light.

The second section of the book contains four longish poems: except for "The Omelet of A. MacLeish," which is, but definitely, satire, and priceless, these poems seem to fit into none of the categories described in the subtitle. Neither do they seem particularly interesting: "The Woman, The War Veteran, and The Bear" seems flat; "The Good Neighbor" and "Lesbia in Hell," ambitious. If they are very early work, they might be described as brilliant undergraduate writing; if they are late, I must confess that I do not know just what to make of them.

Another satirical piece, "The Three Limperary Cripples," leads off the third and final section, which comprises, for the rest, five prose pieces, varying in length from three to twenty pages. In another day, these might have been turned, by a Statius or Ausonius, by a Goldsmith or Wordsworth, into poems: in our own, they impress the reader not as distinct and complete essays, but as fragments that belong somewhere else, in a novel, or an autobiography. This is a pity; for why should writing which has beauty and value in itself, which is completely bounded by and contained in itself, have to be incorporated into something that might make publishers more money? These units, like the poems in the first section, dwell with pleasure and sadness on landscape and houses, on childhood and the elder generation. The four pages under the title "Word Fetishism, or Sick in Four Languages at Odessa," are more contemporary than the others—a passionate brief oration rejoicing in the sensuous delights of the printed page. And the other

[1] Note-Books of Night, by Edmund Wilson. San Francisco: The Colt Press. 113 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passages are eloquent and moving: "At Laurelwood," with twenty years' time between its second and third sections, culminates in credo and affirmation:

I know now that the tides of society can give a new configuration to all but the strongest personalities, if they do not sweep them away. Yet I have dug out again these memories, trifling enough in themselves, in order to make again the contrast between my grandfather's house and the Finches'; and on reflection I have come to the conclusion that I am compelled to recur to these incidents under a stress, at first largely unconscious, of being frightened about the things I have a stake in. It was so at the time of the World War, and it is so again today. For that ride in the Finches' pony-cart was the first moment when it was definitely revealed to me that there were other kinds of people in the world, who did not think and behave like my own family and who were yet at the same time important—that they might be even more important than we; and the first time I remember to have asserted to myself the superior virtue and value of certain things which had reached me through my grandparents—of the spirit that studies and understands against the spirit that acquires and consumes; of the instinct to give life to other beings against the lethal concentration on power; of the impulse that acts to minimize the social differences between human beings, instead of trying to keep them up and make them wider; and of the kind of ambition that attempts to build on this thought and creative instinct and fellowship rather than on the authority of the pony-cart.

So here we have, in these notebooks, the thoughts and feelings of one who cultivates the humanities. When people grow tired of logistic, semantic and polymath sects of criticism, someone, I suggest, might see what can be done with a simple subject-predicate-object school. Quite a lot can be said in this medium, and the literary history of our time guaranteed a greater permanence if its dicta, instead of being enshrined in quarterly reviews, were written up on the walls, like children's graffiti. Thus—*X loves castration; Y loves hatred; Z loves success.* To this might be added: *Wilson loves literature.* Our *fin-de-siècle* bright young man will realize there were not too many, in our time, of whom this might be said. ROLFE HUMPHRIES

The Beards: Part IV

The American Spirit, by Charles A. and Mary R. Beard. New York: The Macmillan Company. 696 pages. $5.

CHARLES AND MARY BEARD have been frequently and indiscriminately accused of an excessive materialism in their interpretation of American history. In this, the fourth volume of "The Rise of American Civilization," they have written upon "the intellectual and moral qualities" of the American heritage with a profusion that will surprise some of their critics. It is doubtful, however, that this book marks any fundamental change in the philosophical perspective of the Beards since 1928, when their first volumes appeared. In turning from their predominant concern with the "outward aspects of civilization" to an estimation, sometimes quite reverent, of American intellectual traditions, the Beards have only followed the recent trend of many critics who have felt the impact of depression and world war. This study is one of the landmarks of an uncommonly intense period of national self-appraisal.

"The American Spirit" is subtitled "A Study of the Idea of Civilization in the United States." It is not—and I think this unfortunate for the completeness of the series—a general intellectual history, but rather a single-minded pursuit of a narrower theme. This theme the Beards have selected in the belief that "no idea, such as democracy, liberty, or the American way of life, expresses the American spirit so coherently, comprehensively and systematically as does the idea of civilization."

The Beards distinguish three sets of world-views which they believe have been widely accepted in Western society: Christianity, the philosophy of the Enlightenment and the idea of civilization. The latter idea, they say, appeared in France between 1750 and 1760 and spread rapidly in the next ten years. It was given wide currency as a result of the American and French Revolutions and was fixed in the American mind early in the nineteenth century by radical writers like Paine and Jefferson, and by Frenchmen like Guizot and Fourier whose works were well known here. The Beards emphasize that the idea of civilization was not identical with the Enlightenment, in spite of a common optimism, but actually signalized a break with it. For although the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment talked of progress and the general interests of humanity, they despised the masses, dreaded democracy and clung to condescending attitudes toward women.

Whatever the term "civilization" meant, it was associated frequently enough with some characteristic dogmas of American optimism. The early spokesmen of the Republic heartily believed that progress in knowledge, morals and social organization is a normal and inevitable tendency. In America they found an especially favorable environment for the continued progress of civilization and they were convinced that American development would continue to be unique and in some sense superior. Here men were given an unlimited opportunity to elevate their society; here they held to a general faith in the capacity of human effort to accomplish the job.

Rejected from the idea of civilization, as the nineteenth century progressed, were all pessimistic and fatalistic world-outlooks, all materialistic or strictly deterministic philosophies. Fundamentally alien to it were both individualism and Marxian socialism, the first because it was anarchic, the second because it substituted "sheer force for the process of enlightenment." Catholicism deliberately withdrew from what Pius IX called "modern civilization." But the arch-enemy was internationalism, which repudiated the idea of American civilization in favor of world or Western society and subversively prepared for a surrender of American sovereignty.

As the authors trace the course of this "idea" through our history, its adequacy as a vehicle for expressing "the American spirit" becomes increasingly suspect. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the Beards, in their search for a concept broad enough to suit their purpose, have only found one that is far too elusive. In the presence of the Beardian usage one all too frequently gets an exasperating sense of incomplete or tangential communication. In common use, the term "civilization" has been far more often a vague semantic device, a eulogistic epithet, than an *idea* with precise and manageable outlines. The notion of civilization was, as this volume shows, invoked in the name of slavery and abolition, of individualism and collec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tivism, of imperialism and pacifism. If this is proof of its universality, it is also proof of its lack of a fixed and recognizable content or a definable allegiance. As its meaning slips away in the course of a long exposition, this study loses its focus. At best, "The American Spirit" is a history of philosophies of history in America; at its worst it often becomes the chronicle of a verbal incantation.

The American people are a people of sections and moods and impulses, of varying classes and traditions. It would be no mean achievement to find in their history the elements of a common faith which distinguishes them from other peoples. But whoever will find the American spirit must probe for it delicately, not with some blunt instrument. Possibly one may extract from the clashing values represented, say, by Wendell Phillips and John C. Calhoun or by William Graham Sumner and Edward Bellamy, some common denominator which will illuminate the course of American development. But the fact that they all invoked "civilization" seems little more revealing than that they all accepted monogamy; perhaps less so, for the meaning of monogamy is generally understood.

In several respects "The American Spirit" marks a decline from the Beards' earlier volumes. The sweeping rhetoric that gave those volumes a distinctive tone is largely absent, and in its place one finds a prose that is often dropsied: "But of course none of the foreign critics who discussed American civilization was, or could be, in fact, a disembodied spirit, timeless and placeless, dissociated from the affections, sentiments, and directives acquired or developed in those experiences." The book contains a great deal of scattered comment and opinion—for its authors have not capitulated to the fiction of "objectivity" in historical writing—but it does not have a central interpretation with an impact comparable to its predecessors. Unlike them, it lacks excitement. It proceeds by a patient and laborious exposition of the speeches, books, essays, and letters of dozens of American intellectual leaders of varying stature. Unhappily many of them are decidedly pedestrian; by summarizing their contributions in detail, often with very lengthy quotation, the authors have been able to compile a representative expression of some features of our political folklore, but they have done so at the cost of much repetition. The tone of their book seldom rises above the tone of their materials.

Probably it is the curious medium through which the Beards have sought to express the American spirit that accounts for their disconcerting choice of sources. There is a perpetual air of yea-saying about the thinkers they have chosen to dwell upon. With the exception of William Graham Sumner and Henry and Brooks Adams, they have generally slighted pessimists and more searching critics as alien to the essential affirmatives of the American spirit. They have also used fugitive writers at the expense of some of the greatest figures. They give Thorstein Veblen only a page, while one Robert Coram, a Delaware librarian and schoolmaster who wrote a tract on education in 1791, gets twelve. But most serious is their neglect of imaginative letters. Here is a study of American attitudes toward civilization almost seven hundred pages long which does not mention Thoreau or Melville, which gives only the slightest passing reference to William and Henry James, which says nothing of Hamlin Garland, which treats of Howells only as the author of "A Traveler from Altruria," which gives to Walt Whitman a scant three pages, which neglects altogether Theodore Dreiser and Sinclair Lewis and many others. It is not surprising that a study so designed should be unable to convey any feeling for the torment and confusion of American intellectual life or for the richness of its achievement. Surely the American spirit was more spirited than this. RICHARD HOFSTADTER

That American Way

And Keep Your Powder Dry, by Margaret Mead. New York: William Morrow and Company. 274 pages. $2.50.

MISS MEAD'S BOOK makes me realize more strongly than ever how difficult it is to understand people—Americans, Germans, the Arapesh, Miss Mead, my friends, myself. Her basic idea is certainly sound. She thinks Americans will do better, during the war and after, if they realize their assets and limitations. Her heart is in the right place—or at any rate I agree with most of her aspirations. She is intelligent, well trained, eager to search out new experience, acquainted with many of the best minds of the day, able to move easily among our accepted generalizations, herself a leader in our thinking.

Then, too, her description of us is in general quite conventional, as she herself points out, although she claims to be using a special kind of reasoning, derived from her study of other cultures, which I must admit I cannot identify. Perhaps this is because her earlier writings have indoctrinated me with the proper logical gospel. She finds the core of American character in the Puritan impulse as it has been modified by such things as the frontier, immigration, population mobility (spatially and up the scale of living) and industrialism. Our life is geared to success; to relatively shallow personal relationships; to patterns of aggression needing to be set in motion from the outside; to a strong ability to analyze processes and discover alternative methods of reaching results, so that our technological achievements are the wonder of the world.

But a culture is more than a congeries of traits. It is an "orchestration" of these traits. It is to be found neither in the traits as analytically separated nor as artificially combined. It exists in the manner and degree to which they are intertwined in actual living. Miss Mead knows this better than I do. But her mind—have I understood her?—is extraordinarily alert and projective. She finds it all but impossible to distinguish her very clear mental processes from her observations. Her thinking is neither subjective nor objective. It runs its happy course in an intermediate realm of constructed things, and in this respect is very American. This book, for example, is largely constructed around two certainly mythical pictures—the picture of four generations of Americans in their changing relations, and the picture of an American mother bringing up her child. The details of these pictures are not facts but palpably constructions of the mind. But let us suppose the pictures are substantially true. They are treated not as part of the tactics of literary exposition, but as though American character had been built upon them as a model. This makes the lighting very high, and many nuances are lost. Her description of us all too often has the flat quality she wrongly attributes to our language.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This quality is especially striking in the last part of the book, which discusses the kind of world we want after the war. We must orchestrate all the world's cultures by combining all the good qualities in each that are compatible with living on a world scale. "It's like a game of permutations and combinations." Think of the fun of "using institutions and sets of habits to build with, as well trained engineers use torques and stresses and tensions." But of course the engineers work in a single physical world, and there are literally hundreds of culture-worlds with the most contradictory "stresses and tensions." The image of orchestration is ridiculous. There is no such thing as orchestration in the abstract—different cultures have different ways of combining sounds. Just try to orchestrate Chinese music with our own and see what you get. But Miss Mead thinks it will come out all right "if we are as stern and inflexible with ourselves as with our enemies." This is Puritanism with a vengeance. And it plays hob with I don't know how many precious culture-ideals. It naïvely assumes that our science is a culture-solvent.

Of course we need a world culture. We might better begin by assuming that since our culture has had the idea, it can provide the fundamental basis for a worldwide pattern of living. Technologically we are forced to make this assumption. Then we might try to discover the different possibilities looking in this direction that are implicit in our existing patterns. These should be considered not as abstract traits but as concrete interlaced ways of living. We should not try to synthesize a culture, but rather to accentuate and develop actually existing desirable aspects of our going pattern. This pattern should be criticized and corrected, so far as possible, in the light of our knowledge of other cultures. If we follow this path we are less likely to be hated by the rest of mankind.

JOHN STORCK

Company History

Biography of a Business, 1792-1942: Insurance Company of North America, by Marquis James. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 431 pages. $4.

TODAY, when the success of government planning is so evident, official business histories often defeat their purpose. Designed to impress investors and customers with the soundness of the company in question, such histories only make the reader wonder whether the state could be less enterprising than private corporations. Modern business historians leave their whitewash brushes at home. To be sure, they neglect important aspects of business administration: rarely do they compare dividend and wage policies or employer and employee attitudes toward unions. But modestly they spotlight past managerial errors, and with literary bonhomie they reveal well known connivance in fraud. The results are often books superficially objective but with damaging implications.

Marquis James's "Biography of a Business" is a book of this type, though it is better than most of the genre. For one thing, Mr. James is a beguiling writer who knows how to tell a story. For another, the insurance business is an unusually complex and interesting one. Finally, the Insurance Company of North America, one of the oldest corporations in the United States, has been involved in many

". . . I cannot put out of my mind the importance of its message." —SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE

GENERALS AND GEOGRAPHERS

THE TWILIGHT OF GEOPOLITICS

By Hans W. Weigert

A book that puts Haushofer's geopolitics into its true perspective. $3.00

". . . The book has fascinated me so that I finished it without stopping. The value of the book is not only that of a mere analysis but a guide to victory. . . . May many read this book. It deserves wide attention."—*Sat. Review of Literature.*

". . . a remarkable book. . . . This is a book that demands and merits thoughtful reading. It should be studied and digested by American and British statesmen."—*The Hartford Times.*

". . . an unusually lucid statement of the basic facts about geopolitics. . . . Mr. Weigert has definitely opened the subject to numerous readers."—*George N. Shuster, President, Hunter College.*

". . . an important book and doubly important through being so timely."
—*Vilhjalmur Stefansson.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 Fifth Avenue • New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spectacular fires, wars and maritime disasters which give color to the narrative.

Founded in Independence Hall in 1792, on the eve of war between England and revolutionary France, this company with paid-in capital of $60,000, began simply as an insurer of hulls. After 1807, however, as war and Jefferson's embargo ruined commerce, fire exceeded marine insurance. Thereafter the history of the company paralleled that of the nation. The expanding West drew insurance agents to the edge of the moving frontier. Steamboats, canals and railroads created "inland marine" business. Gas lighting brought new hazards and new customers, while electricity also revolutionized fire insurance. The automobile opened tremendous opportunities in "casualty," while consumers'-goods industries in the twentieth century required protection for every known commodity. As social needs multiplied, workmen's compensation and unemployment insurance opened new lines for underwriters.

The Insurance Company of North America has been a leader in almost every insurance field. But it has never pioneered. Its squeamishness was illustrated in 1904 when President Charles Platt exclaimed about automobile coverage: "I'll never insure a gasoline can on wheels, the noisy stinking things!" In 1922, when considering a new building, President Benjamin Rush advised the architects: "We want offices in which George Washington would find himself at home." Such horse-and-buggy attitudes frequently endanger policy and stockholders, but more important, they leave other business men to bear the cost of innovations. Fortunately for the nation, these innovators have been numerous. Most business pioneers have ended as financial failures, but their activities justify a system of free enterprise much more than does the success of a thousand great corporations. This is especially true in the insurance business, which can build up or destroy new industries by offering or refusing protection. State as well as corporate bureaucrats can calculate rates from adequate records, but it takes enterprise and courage to underwrite new ventures. Great corporations choke these qualities.

In the mythology of free enterprise, competition is the God of progress. Yet in the light of the current controversy over the closed shop it is interesting to note how in 1938 the Inland Marine Underwriters' Association, a rate-fixing insurance group, closed London reinsurance to all who ignored Association rates. In insurance as in other lines, the struggle for the market has led only toward monopoly. The result is that private business now tolerates policies which, if they were of public concern, would cause public scandal. Between 1885 and 1896, even in the well run North America, shocking lapses in cost accounting led to mounting losses in marine business. Yet within the corporation was a group that persistently obstructed the reforms of Benjamin Rush lest old methods be altered and old jobs abolished.

There is practically nothing in this book on changes in the North America's investment portfolio over one hundred and fifty years. There is equally little on personnel problems which must have arisen when the number of employees reached into the hundreds.

The stream of business histories and business biographies in the last decade indicates directors' growing appreciation of the public's interest in great corporations. The revelations in these histories and biographies indicate that the supposed inefficiency of public as compared with private management is entirely mythical. WILLIAM MILLER

Contributors

THOMAS SANCTON, managing editor of The New Republic, was formerly an AP staff member in New York City and a Nieman Fellow at Harvard. He has just returned from an extended tour of the South.

JENNIE LEE is the well known Scottish trade unionist and political figure. Her autobiography, "This Great Journey," was reviewed in our issue of September 14.

IRVING DILLIARD, one of the first nine Nieman Fellows at Harvard, has been an editorial writer for The St. Louis Post-Dispatch since 1930.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES' most recent volume of poetry is "Out of the Jewel," published by Scribner's last year.

RICHARD HOFSTADTER, recently holder of the William Bayard Cutting Traveling Fellowship at Columbia University, is assistant professor of American History at the University of Maryland.

JOHN STORCK, after a good many years of college teaching, recently resigned, and is at present writing a book on the intellectual problems of the contemporary world.

WILLIAM MILLER is an instructor in American and European History at Washington Square College, New York University. He is co-author with Thomas C. Cochran of "The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America," published this fall by Macmillan and reviewed in our October 19 issue.

The special classroom rate of the New Republic is only 25c a month

per student for orders of ten or more copies to be sent to one address. Desk copy is free.

Address order to the CIRCULATION MANAGER

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street New York City

War Bonds and Stamps

Buy a share in AMERICA. *Invest in your country and help win the war. Get the Victory Habit—buy War Bonds and Stamps every pay day.*

WEARING APPAREL

NOW that clothes are an investment, try Miss Goodman's Original Models. Her Gowns and Coats are the kind that wear and at great savings. 244 Lexington Avenue (34). MU 5-0670.

WANTED TO BUY

LINGUAPHONE. Any language. Indicate condition, language, number of records and books. Room 804, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

Order your books—all books mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th St., New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED